# **Final Report**

# Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis



The Economics of Land Use

Prepared for:

City of Fairfield

Prepared by:

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. 2501 Ninth Street, Suite 200 Berkeley, CA 94710-2515 510 841 9190 tel 510 841 9208 fax

Berkeley Sacramento

Denver

www.epsys.com

June 2011

EPS #20086

# Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS	1
	Key Findings	2
	Key Assumptions	10
	Report Organization	12
2.	Project Description	13
۷.		
	Land Use Program	
	Development Timing	
	Infrastructure Program	
	Project Residents, Employees, and Development Values	16
3.	Analytical Framework and Approach	18
	Policy Framework	18
	Focus on Residential and Commercial Development	18
	Annexation	19
	Budget Considerations and Overview	19
	Cost-Estimating Approaches	20
	Inflation and Appreciation	20
4.	GENERAL FUND REVENUES	22
	Property Tax	22
	Property Tax In-Lieu of Vehicle License Fee	23
	Real Property Transfer Tax	23
	Business Tax	24
	Utility Users' Tax	24
	Vehicle License Fee	24
	Franchise Fees	24
	Fines and Miscellaneous Income	24
	Other Revenues	25

# Table of Contents (continued)

5.	GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES	. 26
	General Government	. 26
	Human Resources	. 27
	Community Resources	. 27
	Public Safety	. 27
	Public Works	. 28
	Finance	. 30
	County-Related Costs	. 30
	Library	. 30
	Other Costs	31

APPENDIX A: Maximum Buildout Scenario

APPENDIX B: Reduced Density Scenario

# List of Tables

Table 1	Annual Fiscal Impact Summary at Residential Buildout	5
Table 2	Proposed Ongoing Funding Sources by Department/Function	6
Table 3	Potential TSSP Additional Annual Service Charges and Revenues	7
Table 4	Estimated General Fund Revenue Requirements for Public Safety and Public Works	8
Table 5	Annual Fiscal Impact Summary at Residential Buildout	9
Table 6	Summary of Proposed Land Uses at FTSSP Buildout - Maximum and Reduced Density Scenarios	14
Table 7	General Fund Revenues at Buildout	22
Table 8	General Fund Expenditures at Buildout	26

# 1. Introduction and Summary of Results

This report describes the fiscal impact analysis of the Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan (FTSSP), an area located adjacent to the City of Fairfield limits, north of Travis Air Force Base. The fiscal impact analysis represents one component of the overall FTSSP Financial Plan with a focus on the financing of ongoing municipal services. Specifically, the fiscal impact analysis estimates the demand that the Project will place on municipal services given established or normative service levels, the capacity of the City to provide services, and the related increased costs to the City's General Fund that may be created. The fiscal impact analysis also estimates the municipal revenues that will be generated to the City's General Fund to offset increased service costs.<sup>1</sup>

The City's goal is to ensure that each new development project provides sufficient revenue for the cost of the services it demands and does not reduce the level of services to existing residents and businesses. The FTSSP Guiding Principles state that new development in the FTSSP pay for the cost of ongoing municipal services. As a result, in addition to characterizing the expected scale and cost of expanded City service provision, the purpose of this analysis is to ensure that the additional service charges placed on new FTSSP residential development—through Community Facilities Districts (CFDs) operating special taxes, Landscape, Lighting, and Maintenance Districts (LLMDs) assessments, and Homeowner Association (HOA) dues—are sufficient to cover any expected shortfalls between City General Fund service costs and revenues associated with FTSSP development. Through such mechanisms, the fiscal impact of the FTSSP development to the City would be expected to be neutral or positive, consistent with the City's goals and expectations.

This fiscal impact analysis is being undertaken at a time of significant economic and financial uncertainty. The Great Recession has caused a significant reduction in local government revenues, including those of the City of Fairfield, caused by reduced economic activity, real estate sales, and retail sales, among other factors. At the same time the State's fiscal difficulties have led to continuing realignments of State services and local funding. As a result, there have been and continue to be cuts in service levels at all levels of government in order to balance budgets. For the City of Fairfield, these cuts have, in some cases, reduced City service levels well below ideal service levels. While it is expected that economic conditions will improve in coming years, the structural effects of the persistent economic weakness are less clear, as is the outcome of the State Budget.

It should be noted that the fiscal results (annual surpluses or deficits) are simply indicators of fiscal performance; they do not mean that the City will automatically have surplus revenues or deficits because the City must have a balanced budget each year. Persistent shortfalls shown in a fiscal analysis may indicate the need to reduce service levels or obtain additional revenues; persistent surpluses will provide the City with resources to reduce liabilities such as deferred maintenance, improve service levels, or build up reserves.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The impacts of one-time cost recovery charges are not included in this analysis.

# **Key Findings**

The 2,970-acre FTSSP area is planned to support up to 6,756 residential units and 362,000 square feet of mixed-use and commercial uses (maximum buildout scenario), with 5,575 residential units considered a conservative estimate of likely residential development (reduced density scenario). The plan also includes capacity for up to 4.6 million square feet of limited industrial/employment uses. Consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City of Fairfield and Canon Station LLC, the fiscal impact analysis focuses on the fiscal impacts of the residential/commercial components only of the FTSSP (the Project).<sup>2</sup> Key findings of the fiscal impact analysis are summarized in **Tables 1** through **5** and described below. All results are expressed in constant 2010 dollars.

1. At buildout of the residential and commercial components of the FTSSP, the additional, ongoing annual expenditures for General Fund public services are estimated at \$10.0 million under the reduced density scenario and \$11.2 million under the maximum buildout scenario.

The level of public services required and the associated costs increase over time as new infrastructure and public facilities are provided and new residents demand public services. The differences in annual service cost estimates at buildout reflect differences in service populations (see **Table 1**).

2. Under both scenarios, police costs and public works costs combined represent over 90 percent of new General Fund service responsibilities and expenditures.

At the current General Plan police service standard of 1.2 officers per 1,000 residents, an additional 23 sworn officers and associated support services will be required to serve the Project at buildout under the maximum buildout scenario. Police services costs are estimated at \$4.8 million and \$5.8 million annually at buildout (in 2010 dollars) under the reduced and maximum scenarios, respectively. Public works costs are estimated at \$4.5 million under both scenarios. Public works expenditures primarily include maintenance of roads, sidewalks and street lights, landscaping, and parks and open space. These cost estimates include a basic level of road maintenance of about \$730,000 annually. This excludes about \$900,000 in additional revenues required to cover the full life-cycle road maintenance costs of about \$1.65 million annually (net of federal funding) (see **Table 1**).

3. At buildout of the residential and commercial development, the City's General Fund is expected to receive annual revenues of about \$4.9 million or \$5.9 million under the reduced and maximum development scenarios, respectively.

New General Fund revenues are expected to be generated over time as development occurs. Property tax revenues, property tax in-lieu of revenues, and property transfer tax together compose about 67 percent of total revenues at buildout under both scenarios. Other significant revenue generators include utility users and franchise taxes at about 10 percent of total revenues each, as well as sales and use tax at about 5 percent of total buildout revenues. The sales and use tax estimate is based on an assumed capture rate of 25 percent

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Canon Station LLC is a group of landowners who collectively own a significant portion of the FTSSP area.

of new resident taxable retail expenditures in the City of Fairfield, a conservative estimate reflecting the location of the FTSSP and retail competition from the City of Vacaville and elsewhere in the region (see **Table 1**).

4. As is common among new large residential developments in California, the Project is estimated to generate a significant net annual fiscal deficit at buildout without additional development-based service charges.

General Fund revenues are estimated to cover about 50 percent of the estimated General Fund expenditures at buildout. Without additional services charges, the annual General Fund deficit is estimated at over \$5.0 million annually under both scenarios at buildout (see **Table 1**).

5. To ensure that the FTSSP covers its own municipal costs, the City will require new FTSSP development to annex into existing or create new CFDs, create new LLMD(s), and participate in an HOA.

There are a number of existing financing mechanisms that other new developments in the City have participated in to ensure sufficient revenues for the provision of public safety, park maintenance, open space, landscaping, and lighting maintenance costs. The City expects new FTSSP development to participate in the following (or the equivalent thereof):

- CFD 2006-1 that charges special taxes to new residential development to fund public safety and parks maintenance.
- New Open Space CFD that will charge special taxes to new residential development to fund parks and open space maintenance and acquisition costs, including a portion of Great Park maintenance costs.
- LLMD that charges assessments to new residential development to fund a range of drainage maintenance, landscaping, parks, and lighting costs.
- HOA that will cover specific landscaping and lighting on collector streets and maintenance costs of parks and open space within development envelopes, in addition to other private services/facilities cost.

**Table 2** shows the allowed/proposed allocation of the different funding sources. **Table 3** provides estimates of the potential annual revenue from these sources at buildout. As shown, the total potential revenues of \$5.5 million under the reduced density scenario and \$6.1 million under the maximum buildout scenario are expected, in aggregate, to be sufficient to cover the annual General Fund deficits.

6. The additional service charges will be directed toward specific improvements to cover General Fund department costs and reduce dependence on General Fund revenues.

**Table 4** shows the proposed allocation of additional maintenance revenues at buildout. As shown, special tax revenues will fund about 45 percent of ongoing public safety expenditures leaving about \$2.6 million and \$3.2 million to be funded by General Fund revenues under the two different scenarios. Landscaping, lighting, and stormwater and drainage costs will be fully funded between LLMD and HOA revenues. Parks and open space costs will also be

primarily funded through FTSSP CFD, LLMD, and HOA revenues. Other public works costs, including road maintenance curb/gutter maintenance, and street sweeping, will not be funded by additional charges and will require an estimated \$870,000 each year in General Fund revenues.

# 7. The additional service charges will reduce the revenue demands on the General Fund to a manageable level.

**Table 5** shows the remaining General Fund department expenditure requirements once additional maintenance revenues have been netted out. The remaining General Fund expenditures are reduced to \$4.3 million under the reduced density scenario and \$5.0 million under the maximum buildout scenario. This level of expenditure can be covered by the estimated General Fund revenues. The additional net revenues of \$650,000 and \$940,000, respectively, will provide a cushion against future real cost escalation and revenue redistribution and could help to cover the additional \$900,000 in annual road replacement costs for which funding is uncertain.

Table 1
Annual Fiscal Impact Summary at Residential Buildout
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Max Buildout Scenario	Reduced Density Scenario
Units	6,756	5,575
General Fund/ Departmental Expen	ditures	
General Government	\$24,353	\$20,072
Human Resources	\$25,472	\$20,994
Community Resources	\$465,913	\$384,002
Community Development	\$91,646	\$75,534
Police	\$5,793,304	\$4,774,794
Fire	\$11,000	\$11,000
Public Works (1)	\$4,478,230	\$4,478,230
Finance	\$46,307	\$38,165
County Booking Fees	\$2,955	\$2,435
County Animal Control	\$53,183	\$43,833
Library	<u>\$200,000</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>
Total Expenditures	\$11,192,362	\$10,049,058
General Revenues		
Property Taxes	\$2,626,960	\$2,181,113
Property Tax in Lieu of VLF	\$1,194,864	\$1,019,459
Sales & Use Tax	\$270,554	\$223,031
Real Property Transfer Tax	\$112,132	\$92,435
Business License Tax	\$25,732	\$25,732
Utility Users Tax	\$638,551	\$526,288
Admissions Tax	\$77,894	\$64,199
Vehicle License Fees	\$52,466	\$43,242
Franchise Fees	\$640,699	\$528,059
Fines and Misc. Income	<u>\$250,693</u>	<u>\$206,619</u>
Total Revenues	\$5,890,545	\$4,910,179
NET SURPLUS/ (DEFICIT)	(\$5,301,817)	(\$5,138,879)

<sup>(1)</sup> Does not include about \$900,000 in additional annual road replacement costs that may be partially funded through non-General Fund sources.

Sources: City of Fairfield; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

Table 2
Proposed Ongoing Funding Sources by Department/ Function
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

		Ne	w Open Spa	ce	
Department/ Function	General Fund	CFD 2006-1	CFD	LLMD	НОА
Police/ Fire	x	х			
Public Works: Landscape & Lighting, Storm Drain				x	x
Public Works: Parks and Open Space		x	x	x	x
Public Works: Roads and Other	x				
Other City Departments	x				
County Service Payments (Library, Booking, Animal Control)	x				

Sources: City of Fairfield; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

Table 3
Potential TSSP Additional Annual Service Charges and Revenues
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Per Unit/ Per Sq.Ft. Fee	Units/Sq.Ft.	Total Fees (2)	Service Fees (TSSP) (2)
Maximum Buildout Scenario				
CFD 2006-1				
SFD	\$602	2,836		\$1,706,620
Other Residential (1)	\$407	3,920		\$1,597,282
Commercial	\$0.21	362,000		\$76,020
Subtotal				\$3,379,922
New Open Space CFD (2)				
Low Density	\$133	1,709	\$226,443	
Medium Density	\$93	2,254	\$208,495	
High Density	\$79	2,793	<u>\$220,368</u>	
Subtotal			\$655,305	
New Open Space CFD Maintenand	e Share (2)			\$163,826
HOA (3)				\$856,520
LLMD (4)				\$1,727,515
<b>Total Maintenance Revenues</b>				\$6,127,783
Reduced Density Scenario				
CFD 2006-1				
SFD	\$602	2,320		\$1,396,106
Other Residential (1)	\$407	3,255		\$1,326,315
Commercial	\$0.21	362,000		<u>\$76,020</u>
Subtotal				\$2,798,441
New Open Space CFD (2)				
Low Density	\$133	1,354	\$179,405	
Medium Density	\$93	1,932	\$178,710	
High Density	\$79	2,289	<u>\$180,602</u>	
Subtotal			\$538,717	
New Open Space CFD Maintenand	e Share (2)			\$134,679
HOA (3)				\$856,520
LLMD (4)				\$1,727,515
Total				\$5,517,156

<sup>(1)</sup> Include single family attached and multifamily units.

Sources: City of Fairfield and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

<sup>(2)</sup> New Open Space CFD will generate annual revenues available for open space and park acquisition and maintenance. It is assumed that 25 percent of total CFD revenues are available to fund annual service costs with 75 percent allocated to acquisition.

<sup>(3)</sup> Based on the cost for lighting and landscaping of collector streets and open space within development envelope. Full HOA dues will include other non-City services.

<sup>(4)</sup> Based on the cost for linear park, lighting and landscaping, storm drain, and water portion of the Lake Park.

Table 4
Estimated General Fund Revenue Requirements for Public Safety and Public Works
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Max Buildout Scenario	Reduced Density Scenario
Units	6,756	5,575
Public Safety		
Police Costs Fire Costs Total Public Satiety Costs	\$5,793,304 <u>\$11,000</u> \$5,804,304	\$4,774,794 <u>\$11,000</u> \$4,785,794
Offsetting Special Taxes/ Fees: CFD 2006-1 (1)	\$2,636,339	\$2,182,784
Net Cost General Fund Revenues Required	\$3,167,964 <b>\$3,167,964</b>	\$2,603,010 <b>\$2,603,010</b>
Public Works: Landscaping, Lighting a	nd Stormwater/Drainage	
Landscaping and Lighting Costs Stormwater and Drainage Total Landsc., Lighting, and SW Costs	\$1,200,585 <u>\$93,700</u> \$1,294,285	\$1,200,585 <u>\$93,700</u> \$1,294,285
Offsetting Special Taxes/ Ass/ Fees: LLMD (6) HOA (7) Offsetting Revenues	\$803,765 <u>\$490,520</u> \$1,294,285	\$803,765 <u>\$490,520</u> \$1,294,285
Net Cost General Fund Revenues Required	\$0 <b>\$0</b>	\$0 <b>\$0</b>
Public Works: Parks & Open Space		
Parks & Open Space Costs	\$2,311,250	\$2,311,250
Offsetting Special Taxes/ Ass/ Fees: CFD 2006-1 (2) New Parks/ Open Space CFD (3) LLMD (4) HOA (5) Offsetting Revenues	\$743,583 \$163,826 \$923,750 <u>\$366,000</u> \$2,197,159	\$615,657 \$134,679 \$923,750 <u>\$366,000</u> \$2,040,086
Net Cost (8) General Fund Revenues Required (8)	\$114,091 <b>\$0</b>	\$271,164 <b>\$0</b>
Public Works: Other		
Road Maintenance Costs (9) Curbs/Gutters and Street Sweeping Total Other Costs	\$733,827 <u>\$138,868</u> \$872,695	\$733,827 <u>\$138,868</u> \$872,695
Offsetting Revenues	\$0	\$0
General Fund Revenues Required	\$872,695	\$872,695

<sup>(1) 78</sup> percent of CFD 2006-1 annual revenues at buildout.

Sources: City of Fairfield; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

<sup>(2) 22</sup> percent of CFD 2006-1 annual revenues at buildout.

<sup>(3)</sup> Assumes 25 percent of revenues from new open space CFD (equivalent to CFD 2004) allocated towards maintenance.

<sup>(4)</sup> LLMD assumed to cover operations and maintenance costs for linear park and the water portion of the Lake Park.

<sup>(5)</sup> HOA assumed to cover maintenance costs of open space within development envelope cost.

<sup>(6)</sup> LLMD assumed to cover lighting and landscaping costs for arterial streets and stormwater and drainage costs.

<sup>(7)</sup> HOA assumed to cover lighting and landscaping cost for collector streets.

<sup>(8)</sup> The remaining net cost includes Great Park maintenance costs that will be covered through the CFD 2006-1 park/ open space revenue allocation from development elsewhere in the City. No costs allocated to General Fund.

<sup>(9)</sup> Road maintenance excludes ultimate rehabilitation and replacement costs which are estimated at about \$900,000 per year. Also, assumes 50 percent of arterial maintenance costs covered by other, non-local sources.

Table 5
Annual Fiscal Impact Summary at Residential Buildout
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Max Buildout Scenario	Reduced Density Scenario
Units	6,756	5,575
General Fund/ Departmental Expenditure	es	
General Government	\$24,353	\$20,072
Human Resources	\$25,472	\$20,994
Community Resources	\$465,913	\$384,002
Community Development	\$91,646	\$75,534
Public Safety (net of special revenues)	\$3,167,964	\$2,603,010
Public Works (net of special revenues) (1)	\$872,695	\$872,695
Finance	\$46,307	\$38,165
County Booking Fees	\$2,955	\$2,435
County Animal Control	\$53,183	\$43,833
Library	<u>\$200,000</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>
Total Expenditures	\$4,950,488	\$4,260,739
General Revenues		
Property Taxes	\$2,626,960	\$2,181,113
Property Tax in Lieu of VLF	\$1,194,864	\$1,019,459
Sales & Use Tax	\$270,554	\$223,031
Real Property Transfer Tax	\$112,132	\$92,435
Business License Tax	\$25,732	\$25,732
Utility Users Tax	\$638,551	\$526,288
Admissions Tax	\$77,894	\$64,199
Vehicle License Fees	\$52,466	\$43,242
Franchise Fees	\$640,699	\$528,059
Fines and Misc. Income	<u>\$250,693</u>	<u>\$206,619</u>
Total Revenues	\$5,890,545	\$4,910,179
NET SURPLUS/ (DEFICIT) (2)	\$940,057	\$649,440

<sup>(1)</sup> Does not include about \$900,000 in additional annual road replacement costs that may be partially funded through non-General Fund sources.

Sources: City of Fairfield; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

<sup>(2)</sup> Implies sufficient surplus to cover portion of additional \$900,000 of annual road replacement costs that cannot be funded through other sources or to cover unexpected cost increases.

# **Key Assumptions**

The analysis is based on a number of sources, including the City's FY2010–2011 Adopted Budget, interviews with City staff, other data sources, and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.'s (EPS's) prior work experience in similar jurisdictions. The two core underlying assumptions in this report are: (1) the FTSSP area will be annexed into the City of Fairfield and (2) real estate market conditions will drive full buildout of the proposed development program based on the absorption schedule as assumed in this analysis. A broad range of other assumptions are described throughout this report that also contribute to the findings described above.

Key assumptions with significant implications for the fiscal results are summarized below. While these and the other assumptions represent reasonable approaches/estimates based on currently available information, future fiscal conditions may be affected by policy shifts, including required levels of services and revenue-sharing agreements between the City and County, etc., as well as changing market and budgetary conditions and other factors.

- Residential/Commercial Focus. The fiscal impact analysis focuses on the residential/ commercial component of the FTSSP for two reasons: (1) The absorption of the industrial development is more uncertain; (2) Industrial development, when it does occur, is expected to have a positive impact of the City's General Fund. Focusing on the residential/ commercial component thereby provides a conservative approach to ensuring sufficient revenues are generated to cover costs.
- **Development Timing**. Residential and commercial development timing is programmed to be consistent with the 20-year buildout schedule assumed in other FTSSP documents.
- Infrastructure Phasing. No formal infrastructure/capital facilities phasing program has been developed so new roadways and associated infrastructure are phased proportionally to unit development. It is recognized that actual infrastructure/facility investments may occur in a less linear process. Lake Park development and Great Park development are assumed to occur in two or more increments with expected phasing provided by the City.
- Police Service Standard. The police service standard applied is the General Plan standard
  of 1.2 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. This is somewhat above the current ratio of 1.07
  sworn officers per 1,000 residents (assumes 114 sworn officers and 106,440 residents),
  though this ratio is an underestimate of the City's effective service standard given that the
  population estimate includes Travis Air Force Base, which provides its own public safety
  services.
- Road Maintenance Costs. The road maintenance unit costs were provided by the City's Public Works Department and reflect published standards for life-cycle maintenance costs including annual maintenance costs and annualized capital replacement costs. This analysis assumes that one-half of the arterial maintenance cost is covered by non-Project related funding such as State and Federal funding sources (i.e. gas taxes, grants, etc.). This analysis also excludes the annual capital replacement costs, over 50 percent of the total life-cycle maintenance costs. This is an "optimistic" assumption and assumes that replacement costs and a portion of maintenance cost could be covered by non-Project sources of funding. This level of maintenance expenditure is closer to the current budget-constrained General Fund road maintenance services that the Public Works Department is currently able to

provide than the preferred City life-cycle service level. To the extent that the General Fund could fully cover life-cycle road maintenance costs, the Public Works costs would increase by about \$900,000 per year by Project buildout.

- **Fire Service Costs**. An existing fire station will be relocated in order to serve the FTSSP and other planned northeast area development. This relocation is assumed to have a minimal impact on the maintenance cost as the relocation would not result in any substantial service increase. This analysis reflects a marginal cost approach with an annual cost increase estimated at \$11,000.
- Residential Development Values. Market-rate residential development values are assumed to be \$390,000 for low-density units, \$330,000 for medium-density units, and \$225,000 for high-density units. The market rate values for the low- and medium-density products are based on recent home sales price averages at selected City of Fairfield and City of Vacaville developments. City staff indicates the comparable projects/product types and the sales price data was obtained from The Gregory Group. The high-density development values are based on estimates of the capitalized value of existing apartment buildings and input from City staff.
- Home Value Appreciation. Price appreciation (above inflation) is assumed to be minimal
  but sufficient to maintain assessed values in constant dollar terms under Proposition 13. No
  additional real price appreciation is attached to potential future improvements in the
  economy and real estate market or to the evolution of the FTSSP as a major amenitized
  community.
- Annexation and Property Tax Sharing. The City is assumed to receive 12.5 percent of
  the 1.0 percent property tax charged to new assessed value generated by development
  under the FTSSP. No potential property tax deductions/shifts to the County have been
  incorporated associated with the annexation and the County's potential loss of revenues.
- Sales and Use Tax Calculation. New residents at the FTSSP will make taxable retail expenditures, a portion of which will occur at City of Fairfield retail establishments. The proximity and competitiveness of City of Vacaville retail establishments, along with the MOU direction for City staff to provide a conservative capture rate, have resulted in the application of a 25 percent City of Fairfield capture rate.
- Single-Family Detached and Other Development Distinction. The FTSSP residential program includes low-, medium-, and high-density designations. For the purposes of estimating relative cost allocations and fees, the residential development program is also separated into single-family detached and other residential (single-family attached and multifamily development) categories. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that all of the low-density units and half of the medium-density designations fall in the single-family detached category with the remainder falling in the other residential category.

# Report Organization

This report consists of five chapters. Following this introductory chapter, **Chapter 2** describes the development program in detail. **Chapter 3** discusses the overall approach and methodology used in the analysis. **Chapter 4** presents the analysis of General Fund revenues, and **Chapter 5** examines the General Fund expenditures. The detailed analysis for two development scenarios is summarized in the appendices<sup>3</sup>. The maximum buildout scenario is described in **Appendix A** and the reduced density scenario is described in **Appendix B**.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> This analysis evaluates two residential development programs, a maximum residential density and a reduced residential density scenario, as described in Chapter 2.

# 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This chapter outlines key elements of the Fairfield FTSSP development program and associated assumptions that drive the fiscal impact analysis. These elements include the land use program and assumptions concerning potential development values and absorption as well as population and employment densities. The project description includes discussion of the overall land use program, though as discussed in **Chapter 3**, the fiscal impact analysis is focused on the residential and commercial components of the Project.

# Land Use Program

The City of Fairfield is located in central Solano County and is home to 106,000 residents and 45,000 jobs (see **Tables A-1 and B-1**). The FTSSP area consists of 2,970 acres located in the City of Fairfield's planning area and extends outside the current City limits. Most of the proposed development, except for the northern portions, is located within the Specific Plan area within the City's sphere of influence and urban limit line. The current land uses of the site are predominantly agricultural (cattle grazing) with rural housing, though there is also an area with industrial and light industrial uses. This FTSSP assumes that the Project would be annexed to the City from the unincorporated Solano County.

#### **Maximum Development Program**

The site is planned to support up to a maximum of 6,756 residential units and 362,000 square feet of mixed-use commercial space based on the development program in the AECOM Specific Plan, including 176,000 square feet of retail and 186,000 square feet of mixed-use commercial, envisioned as neighborhood-serving retail uses and office space. The plan also includes capacity for up to 4.6 million square feet of limited industrial/employment uses, envisioned as industrial development.<sup>4</sup> These represent the maximum buildout scenario analyzed in this report (see below). The FTSSP area will include the planned Capitol Corridor railroad train station. In addition, the Specific Plan includes approximately 154 acres of parks, a fire training center, a school, and community facilities.

#### Density

The residential units range in types and density from low-density units at 4 to 10 units per acre to high-density units at 20 to 50 units per acre. Low-density residential reflects detached development with a target density of 7 units per acre and expected range of 4 to 10 units per acre. Medium-density residential reflects attached housing types with a target density of 14 units per acre and range of 10 units to 20 units per acre. High-density residential reflects higher-intensity and mixed-use configuration with a target density of 28 units per acre.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The fiscal impacts of the employment/industrial components of the FTSSP are not considered in this analysis given the greater uncertainly over the timing of the industrial development and the expectation that industrial development will pay for itself or generate a fiscal surplus.

#### **Scenarios**

This analysis evaluates two residential development programs, a maximum residential buildout and a reduced residential density scenario, as summarized in **Table 6**. A development program by planning area for each scenario is shown in **Tables A-2** and **B-3** and **B-3**. While the commercial program is the same under both scenarios, differences in the residential programs are described below.

- Maximum residential buildout scenario (6,756 units) represents the maximum potential development under the FTSSP. This scenario evaluates the plan to the extent that residential development would be realized to its fullest potential. It reflects about 25 percent of the units planned as low density with another 33 percent planned as medium density, and the remaining 41 percent as high density. The analysis associated with this development program is included in Appendix A.
- Reduced residential density scenario (5,575 units) represents the City's conservative, best estimate of future development. This scenario accounts for a possibility that the maximum allowable density may not be realized, as is often the case. It reflects roughly a similar density distribution as a maximum residential density scenario with about 24 percent of the units planned as low density with another 35 percent planned as medium density, and the remaining 41 percent as high density. The analysis associated with this development program is included in Appendix B.

Table 6 Summary of Proposed Land Uses at FTSSP Buildout - Maximum and Reduced Density Scenarios

	Maximum Build Shown in Sp			nsity Scenario ancing Plan
Land Use	Units	Avg. Density	Units	Avg. Density
Residential				
Single-Family Residential		Units/Acre		Units/Acre
Single-Family Low Density (RL)	64	5.3	64	5.3
Single-Family Low-Medium Density (RLM)	1,645	7.0	1,290	5.5
Single-Family Medium Density (RM)	<u>2,254</u>	<u>14.0</u>	<u>1,932</u>	<u>12.0</u>
Total Single-Family Residential	3,963	9.7	3,286	8.0
Multifamily Residential				
Multifamily High Density (RH)	2,429	26.7	2,289	25.2
Mixed-Use Commercial (RVH/CM) [3]	<u>364</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>NA</u>
Total Multifamily Residential	2,793	26.7	2,289	25.2
Total Residential	6,756	13.5	5,575	11.2

#### **Planning Areas**

The FTSSP is broken into nine distinct planning areas. The large majority of the residential and commercial/mixed-use development is concentrated in planning areas 1 through 5, the planning areas closest to the train station site. Planning area 6 is envisioned as a future 316-acre

employment hub with up to 4.6 million square feet of limited industrial/employment uses. It is located in the eastern portion of the site and will also function as a transitional land use between residential neighborhoods and the overflight zones at the Travis Air Force Base.

Planning area 7 represents a 687-acre open space buffer and recreation area located within the northern portion of the FTSSP. It includes a 50-acre Great Park, a community active recreation park designed to serve the large-scale sports field needs in Fairfield. Planning area 8 represents a 942-acre area located in the eastern half of the FTSSP and includes habitat conservation and mitigation bank and open space trails for long-term land conservation.

## **Development Timing**

An annual development schedule was required to conduct detailed fiscal impact analysis. A phased development schedule for the residential and commercial components was developed and programmed to be consistent with the 20-year buildout in the Environmental Impact Report. EPS has made a number of assumptions to translate the program by planning area into an annual absorption schedule based on the likely sequence of development between planning areas. This approach results in the average annual absorption of 279 units in the reduced density scenario and 338 units in the maximum buildout scenario, as shown in **Tables A-4** and **B-4**. To the extent that this level of absorption would not be achieved by the Project, the buildout period will extend beyond 20 years assumed in this analysis. The development timing and absorption schedule is based on the following assumptions:

- a) Overall annual absorption rates are controlled by plausible market absorption rate (i.e., below 400 units per year for residential).
- b) Multiple planning areas will be developed at one time, with an overlapping order of planning area as follows: 4, 5, 3, 1, 2, 9, and 6.
- c) Higher-density residential will initially lag given the short-term weakness in the real estate market and the City's relative lack of this product type. Similar to higher-density residential uses, commercial employment uses are assumed to initially lag, with 55,000 square feet delivered in Year 4 and the remaining 307,000 square feet between Years 17 and 20.
- d) Commercial development is expected to occur in proportion to the residential development in each planning area. Commercial development phasing is assumed sufficient from the market demand perspective generated by new housing growth.

Development timing for a project of this scale and size is highly variable and will likely depend on a wide range of factors. As a result, the development timing is utilized as an analytical tool for evaluating the Project's fiscal performance during snapshot years (Years 5, 10, 15, and 20) rather than to prescribe the pace of development.

# Infrastructure Program

The phasing of infrastructure will have a significant impact on operating costs. The infrastructure program shown in **Tables A-3** and **B-3** provides potential phasing of parks, roads, and other uses. The Project is assumed to include approximately 154 acres of parks, 229 acres of roads,

and 1,531 acres of open space, conservation, and recreation uses. Other major infrastructure required to serve the development, including water and sewer utilities, will be provided, in one manner or another as enterprise activities. Therefore, they are not included in this analysis of the impacts on the City's General Fund.

The resulting infrastructure timing is illustrated in **Tables A-5** and **B-5** based on the estimates provided by Carlson, Barbee, and Gibson. While capital costs are not evaluated in this analysis, the timing of these costs is assumed to trigger operating costs associated with capital improvements within the FTSSP. As a result, public improvements are assumed to be developed in proportion to residential development within the plan, except for improvements, such as the Great Park and Lake Park, where specific assumptions were provided by the City.

# Project Residents, Employees, and Development Values

Assumptions regarding price points, population, and employment associated with the FTSSP are shown in **Tables A-6** and **B-6**, while resulting population, employment, and assessed values on an annual basis are shown in **Tables A-7** and **B-7**. The key assumptions are described below.

#### **Project Residents and Employees**

Different residences will appeal to different households depending on their type, size, pricing, and amenities. The number of persons in each unit will vary with density as low-density, single-family homes tend to appeal more to households with children than higher-density units. Average household size for the low-density detached units is assumed to be 3.4 persons, while medium-density units are assumed to consist of, on average, 2.9 persons. High-density units are assumed to consist of an average of 2.4 persons per household. These assumptions yield a population total of 15,700 under the reduced density scenario and 19,060 under the maximum buildout scenario.

In addition, retail space will support new employment with a density of one employee per 350 square feet assumed in this analysis, while mixed-use commercial space is assumed to have higher employee density with 300 square feet per employee. These ratios reflect standard space requirements for retail and office jobs and result in over 1,100 employees, excluding limited industrial/employment uses.

#### **Project Development Value**

Current economic conditions are weak and uncertain as the United States and California slowly recover from the Great Recession. The housing market downturn, ensuing job losses and pay cuts, and the associated collapse of housing prices and increases in foreclosures combined to have profound effects upon local economies, growth, and related fiscal conditions in California cities and counties. Like other communities throughout California, Solano County has seen increases in foreclosures and significant declines in its median home values. The market is still on the road to recovery, held back by the level and uncertainty of household incomes, very conservative lending practices, and ongoing foreclosures.

Price points in the City of Fairfield reached unsustainable levels in the mid-2000s and have since fallen significantly. The level of market recovery and price appreciation still to come is uncertain. This analysis takes a conservative approach by estimating development values on the sales prices of existing projects in the City of Fairfield for low- and medium-density products, as shown in **Tables A-6** and **B-6**. As a result, the analysis neither reflects any further market appreciation nor applies a premium associated with the planned amenities within the FTSSP. High-density product is assumed to be rental with development values based on current capitalized rental rates. The resulting development value assumptions include:

- Low Density (4 to 10 units per acre): \$390,000
- Medium Density (10 to 20 units per acre): \$330,000
- High Density (20 to 50 units per acre): \$225,000
- Commercial: EPS assumes commercial building values are \$250 per square foot

# 3. Analytical Framework and Approach

This chapter highlights some of the key elements of the approach and methodologies used in identifying and estimating the fiscal impacts of the FTSSP. More detailed explanation of methodology and assumptions relevant to particular revenue or expenditure categories are provided in **Chapters 4** and **5**.

## **Policy Framework**

The fiscal impact analysis responds to a policy framework that has been established by the City that has a direct bearing on cost and revenue assumptions (see Section 14.0 of the FTSSP Specific Plan – "Implementation and Administration" – and Section 14.8.2 (Financing of Municipal Services, in particular). The FTSSP notes that "it is the goal of the Specific Plan that new development within FTSSP:

- 1. Will have adequate municipal services
- 2. Generates sufficient tax revenue equal to or greater than the cost of municipal services it requires
- 3. Does not result in a future reduction in municipal services to existing residents and businesses within the city"

It also notes that "through the establishment of the CFDs, LLMDs and HOAs, sufficient revenue will be generated to the City to pay for the full cost of services provided to new development within the Specific Plan."

In addition, the City has indicated that level of service assumptions and related General Fund costs for the FTSSP should meet service standards outlined in City policy documents and will often need to exceed the existing low recession-era service levels. For example, FTSSP residential development is expected to provide a service standard of 1.2 sworn officers per 1,000 residents consistent with the General Plan; similarly the level of service standard for road maintenance will need to be higher than the current modest levels.

# Focus on Residential and Commercial Development

The MOU between the City of Fairfield and the Canon Station LLC provides a particular focus for the FTSSP fiscal impact analysis. Underlying the MOU is the expectation that new light industrial development, programmed for planning area 6, will generate a positive fiscal impact for the City's General Fund. As a result, the MOU calls for a fiscal impact analysis that focuses on the Specific Plan's residential component to determine the fiscal deficit (or surplus) and the potential need for and level of an annual special tax on housing to help in funding the provision of the appropriate public services. As a result, the fiscal impact analysis focuses on the new residential

development and the infrastructure and public facilities that would support it. Because the commercial areas are integrated and connected to the residential development, they are also included in the analysis.

The large majority of the infrastructure and public facilities will be required to serve the residential component of the FTSSP and, as a result, only the operations and maintenance costs associated with roads internal to planning area 6 are allocated to the light industrial development.

#### Annexation

Implementation of the FTSSP will require an annexation of the Project area into the City of Fairfield from unincorporated Solano County. The implications of annexation and associated tax-sharing issues have been assumed to result in the allocation of 12.5 percent of the 1 percent property tax applied to the net new assessed value produced by new development under the FTSSP to the City of Fairfield's General Fund. The County is assumed to maintain its share of the existing base of assessed value as well as receive any portion of property tax revenues typically captured by the County from City-based development. No other transfers between the City and County are assumed in this analysis.

## **Budget Considerations and Overview**

The Great Recession has caused a significant reduction in local government revenues, including those of the City of Fairfield, resulting from reduced economic activity, real estate sales, retail sales, etc. At the same time the State's fiscal difficulties have led to continuing realignments of State services and local funding. As a result, there have been significant cuts in service levels in order to balance their budget. These cuts have now reduced City services below ideal service levels, including those expressed in planning documents, such as the General Plan. Furthermore, the State Legislature is considering a draft State Budget that contains substantial additional local government revenue and cost realignment, likely to further constrain the budget circumstances of California cities. While it is expected that economic conditions will improve in coming years, the slow pace of recovery, the structural effects of persistent economic weaknesses, and long-term challenges for the State Budget make it unlikely that these fiscal challenges will dissipate significantly in the short to medium term.

More specifically, Solano County has experienced one of the highest foreclosure rates in the country. As a result, the City's key revenues, such as property taxes and sales taxes, have declined with property taxes falling by 59 percent. This has constrained the City's expenditures on public services since FY2007–08 and resulted in budget cuts and departmental restructuring. For the purposes of this analysis, as described below, in the absence of specific service standards and/or input from department staff, the most recent FY2010–11 Adopted Budget is considered a reasonable basis to support this analysis. A summary of the major General Fund revenues and costs is provided in **Tables A-8** and **B-8**.

# Cost-Estimating Approaches

#### Case Study/Marginal Approach

EPS interviewed the City's departments and has worked closely with department directors and their staff over the course of the past several months to collect necessary data to forecast public service needs for the Project area and estimate costs associated with providing those services. The most in-depth interviews were conducted with the police, fire, and public works departments because of the typical scale and complexity of their service impacts from new development. Based on these interviews and additional discussions with the City Manager's Office, key data and assumptions were gathered and individual calculations were made. Similarly, major revenue items were estimated based on input provided by the City Manager's Office and the City's Budget and Finance offices as well as project-specific value estimates, absorption schedules, and available data on retail spending patterns. These major revenue items include property tax, property tax in-lieu of vehicle license fee (VLF), and sales tax.

#### **Average Estimate Approach**

In addition to the interviews with the police, fire, and public works departments, EPS interviewed other departmental and City Manager's Office staff concerning community development, community resources, finance, human resources, and other costs. In most of these cases an average cost estimate approach was used, whereby the current level of revenue or cost of providing services citywide, excepting the fixed cost component, is divided by the existing City population or employment to estimate an average per unit cost to apply to the Project. Most General Fund items include a "fixed component" that is not expected to change based on new development. From a cost perspective, fixed costs are typically associated with "base" staffing levels and administrative or other overhead costs that would be expended regardless of the amount of future development. Other revenue items are also forecasted based on this current citywide average revenue per person/employee approach. Current citywide population and employment estimates are shown in Tables A-1 and B-1 and per capita estimating factors are presented in Tables A-8 and B-8.

# Inflation and Appreciation

The treatment of inflation and appreciation in the fiscal impact analysis is described below.

- This analysis is conducted in 2010 constant dollar terms. While inflation will continue to apply to revenues and costs in the future, the difference in the rate of nominal increases in revenues and costs is assumed to be minimal.
- The assumption that property tax revenues from existing properties increase at the pace of inflation (typically between 2 and 3 percent) implies a modest real appreciation in the value of new homes. As a result of Proposition 13 and the caps on assessed value of existing development, the pace of change of existing assessed value is a complex interrelationship between Proposition 13 reassessment limits, turnovers rates, inflation, and real estate appreciation over and above inflation. For the purposes of this analysis, EPS has assumed a level of real price appreciation that balances out the deflationary effects of Proposition 13 on

- non-turned-over properties. To the extent that real appreciation (price appreciation above inflation) in home values is above 0.5 percent per annum for the FTSSP, property tax revenues would improve over time.
- The assumption that costs increase at the pace of inflation also presumes that future contract negotiations with city employees across all departments on average result in increases that are on a par with the pace of increase in inflation.

# 4. GENERAL FUND REVENUES

This chapter describes the methodology and key assumptions used in estimating the annual revenue that would accrue to the City's General Fund from the new development in the FTSSP, as shown in **Tables A-9** and **B-9**. The analysis is based on a number of sources including interviews with the City department directors and their staff, City of Fairfield's FY2010–2011 Adopted Budget, and EPS's experience in comparable jurisdictions. **Table 7** summarizes the results for both scenarios.

Table 7 General Fund Revenues at Buildout

Item	Max Buildout Scenario	Reduced Density Scenario
Units	6,756	5,575
General Revenues		
Property Taxes	\$2,626,960	\$2,181,113
Property Tax in Lieu of VLF	\$1,194,864	\$1,019,459
Sales & Use Tax	\$270,554	\$223,031
Real Property Transfer Tax	\$112,132	\$92,435
Business License Tax	\$25,732	\$25,732
Utility Users Tax	\$638,551	\$526,288
Admissions Tax	\$77,894	\$64,199
Vehicle License Fees	\$52,466	\$43,242
Franchise Fees	\$640,699	\$528,059
Fines and Misc. Income	<u>\$250,693</u>	<u>\$206,619</u>
Total Revenues	\$5,890,545	\$4,910,179

# **Property Tax**

Property tax is one of the largest sources of the City's General Fund revenue, accounting for nearly 20 percent of current General Fund revenue. Property tax is also expected to be the largest source of General Fund revenue generated from the new development. Property tax is calculated by taking 1.0 percent of the estimated project assessed value. The assessed value is calculated based on the land use program, achievable value by product type, and the estimated absorption schedule.

It is assumed that the Project would be annexed into the City of Fairfield from the unincorporated Solano County. As shown in **Tables A-10** and **B-10**, the Project would result in annual revenue of \$2.2 million under the reduced density scenario and \$2.6 million under the maximum buildout scenario to the Fairfield General Fund by buildout. The estimate is based on the City's General Fund capture of 12.5 percent of 1.0 percent of the new assessed value based on the Master Property Tax Transfer Agreement between the County of Solano and the City of Fairfield.

# Property Tax In-Lieu of Vehicle License Fee

Changes in the State budget converted a significant portion of VLF subventions, previously distributed by the State based on a per capita formula, into property tax distributions. These distributions increase over time based on assessed value. As the development of the FTSSP results in net new increases in the City's assessed value, the in-lieu revenues accruing to the City's General Fund will increase proportionately, as shown in **Tables A-11** and **B-11**.

# Real Property Transfer Tax

The City of Fairfield collects a property transfer tax of \$0.55 per \$1,000 of transferred value. The analysis estimates the tax based on the assumed values and absorption of the development program after initial building sales. Ten percent of residential property is assumed to sell every year after the initial sale of new units; this rate represents an average and will vary year to year depending on economic conditions and average length of ownership by the occupants.

The City will receive the tax upon sale of land and newly developed units. However, real property transfer taxes associated with the initial sales are one-time sales and are not considered in this analysis, as shown in **Tables A-11** and **B-11**.

#### Sales and Use Tax

Sales tax is the largest source of the City's General Fund revenue, accounting for 28 percent of the current General Fund proceeds. This analysis assumes that new households in the Project would be the primary source of new taxable sales in the City. Housing development in the FTSSP will bring new households to the City. These households are assumed to have an average household income of about \$57,000, which is below the existing mean family income in the City. Each household is assumed to spend 27 percent of its income on taxable goods (based on the Consumer Expenditure Survey for the San Francisco Metropolitan Statistical Area), of which Fairfield establishments are assumed to capture 25 percent.

The 25 percent retail capture assumption reflects a conservative estimate as the capture of the City's sales tax from FTSSP residents relative to other jurisdictions is uncertain. This estimate is based on the Project's location within proximity to Vacaville's retail that could shift some retail sales from existing Fairfield retail. To the extent that a higher capture level for Fairfield establishments is assumed, fiscal impacts would improve.

Some of the retail spending captured within the City boundary will be captured by the new retail establishments in the Project area, with the rest captured at City establishments outside the Project area. This approach assumes that the new retail in the FTSSP does not generate any net new sales to the City outside of the sales to new FTSSP residents. Sales tax calculations are illustrated in **Tables A-12** and **B-12**.

#### **Business Tax**

The City collects annual business taxes from businesses operating in Fairfield. These taxes average \$23 per employee based on the FY2010–11 Adopted Budget with the rate applied to new employment generated by the FTSSP (see **Tables A-8** and **B-8**). Detailed business tax revenues generated by the Project will depend on a number of factors, such as business type, size, and sales generated.

# Utility Users' Tax

Utility users' tax is levied by the City of Fairfield on utility bills for telephone, gas, and electric services (cable service is not subject to utility tax). As such, this revenue source depends on the utility consumption of the City's households and businesses. Based on the FY2010–11 Adopted Budget, the City is expected to receive approximately \$33.50 per capita in utility users' tax revenue (see **Tables A-8** and **B-8**).

#### **Admissions Tax**

The City charges admissions tax for the use of facilities such as golf courses. Increased population associated with the Project is estimated to increase the City's share of the admissions tax proceeds. Based on the FY2010–11 Adopted Budget, these proceeds average \$4 per capita, with the same rate applied to Project population growth in this analysis, as shown in **Tables A-8** and **B-8**.

#### Vehicle License Fee

As discussed earlier, VLF revenues have been significantly reducing because of the State budget balancing actions in the 2004–2005 fiscal year. According to the FY2010–11 Adopted Budget, the City expects to receive about \$293,000, or \$2.75 per capita in VLF (see **Tables A-8** and **B-8**). The reduction is compensated through additional property tax in-lieu revenues, which is described earlier in this chapter.

#### Franchise Fees

Franchise fees are levied by the City of Fairfield on utility bills for gas and electric services, solid waste, and cable service bills. As such, this revenue source depends on the utility consumption of the City's households and businesses. Based on the FY2010–11 Adopted Budget, the City is expected to receive approximately \$34 per capita in franchise fee revenue (see **Tables A-8** and **B-8**).

#### Fines and Miscellaneous Income

According to the FY2010–11 Adopted Budget, the City receives \$1.4 million in fines and miscellaneous income. This averages to \$13 per capita from fines and fees, as shown in **Tables A-8** and **B-8**.

# Other Revenues

The City of Fairfield also receives revenues, such as intergovernmental, interest income, development-related (one-time) fees, and department revenues. These fees are not likely to be significantly affected by the FTSSP and are excluded from this analysis.

# 5. General Fund Expenditures

This chapter describes the methodology and key assumptions used in estimating the annual costs to the City's General Fund of providing public services to the new residents and employees in the FTSSP. The analysis is based on interviews with City departments and a number of other sources including the City of Fairfield FY2010–11 Adopted Budget and EPS's experience. The analysis below estimates the annual operating cost impacts on the City's General Fund through the buildout of the Project, as shown in **Tables A-13** and **B-13**.

The purpose of this analysis is to estimate the ongoing impact of providing public services to the FTSSP on the City's General Fund. Therefore, one-time capital costs are not included in this fiscal analysis (such as buildings, initial setup costs, vehicles, and durable equipment). However, costs associated with ongoing need for supplies (such as new materials for the library) are considered a part of an O&M cost and are included in the fiscal impact analysis. **Table 8** summarizes the results for both scenarios.

Table 8 General Fund Expenditures at Buildout

Item	Max Buildout Scenario	Reduced Density Scenario
Units	6,756	5,575
General Fund/ Departmental Expe	enditures	
General Government	\$24,353	\$20,072
Human Resources	\$25,472	\$20,994
Community Resources	\$465,913	\$384,002
Community Development	\$91,646	\$75,534
Police	\$5,793,304	\$4,774,794
Fire	\$11,000	\$11,000
Public Works (1)	\$4,478,230	\$4,478,230
Finance	\$46,307	\$38,165
County Booking Fees	\$2,955	\$2,435
County Animal Control	\$53,183	\$43,833
Library	<u>\$200,000</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>
Total Expenditures	\$11,192,362	\$10,049,058

#### General Government

According to the City's FY2010–11 Adopted Budget, the City spends \$544,000 a year to provide general government services, which include the City Attorney, Treasurer, Clerk, Manager, Economic Development, and Mayor and Council divisions. This analysis assumes that 25 percent of General Government administration costs are variable and likely to increase with the addition of new population. Therefore, costs resulting from the Project are estimated at 25 percent of current expenditure, or \$1.28 per capita (see **Tables A-8** and **B-8**). It is worth stating that the City Manager's Office, as well as all administrative and support staff, gets reimbursed for its costs by other funds based on its time allocation.

#### **Human Resources**

The Human Resources Department is responsible for citywide staffing and consists of Risk Management and Employee Relations Divisions. As demand for staff increases because of population growth associated with the Project, Human Resources cost will be affected. This analysis assumes that 25 percent of the Human Resources costs are variable and likely to increase with the addition of new population. As a result, per capita cost of \$1.34 is assumed, as shown in **Tables A-8** and **B-8**.

# Community Resources

The Community Resources Department offers a range of services, including affordable housing programs, community classes, neighborhood programs, senior services, sports and aquatics, and youth activities. It also maintains public facilities. Based on the FY2010–11 Adopted Budget, the Department's cost is estimated at \$5.0 million, with over 40 percent of it recovered through user fees. EPS assumes that 90 percent of the net cost would be variable, resulting in the per capita estimate of \$24, as shown in **Tables A-8** and **B-8**.

#### **Community Development**

The Community Development Department is responsible for physical development in Fairfield. Community Development consists of building and planning divisions. While economic development has historically been included under Community Development, this service was recently shifted to City Manager's Office in the cost-cutting and restructuring efforts.

Community Development charges fees for services with the fees covering the majority of the General Fund cost. As a result, this analysis utilizes an average cost per daytime population approach to estimate the Community Development Department cost to the City's General Fund and assumes that 70 percent of this cost will be offset by development-related cost recovery fees, as shown in **Tables A-8** and **B-8**. This results in the per-capita estimate of \$24.81. The actual share of cost recovery will depend on the rate of growth in fees relative to future department costs.

# **Public Safety**

#### **Police**

This analysis assumes that a total of 23 police officers would be required to serve the area given the size and the location of the FTSSP. Because the Police Department emphasized that the current staffing and resources have already been stretched to their limits, EPS assumes that there is no excess capacity and the new residential development would require new officers based on the General Plan standard of 1.2 sworn officers per 1,000 population. The service standard applied is the General Plan standard of 1.2 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. This is somewhat above the current ratio of 1.07 sworn officers per 1,000 residents (assumes 114 sworn officers and 106,440 residents), though this ratio is an underestimate of the City's effective service standard given that the population estimate includes Travis Air Force Base, which provides its own public safety services.

As a result, a total of 23 new sworn police officers are estimated to be required by the buildout of the Project. It is assumed that the need for new officers would be proportional to new population with the per sworn officer cost based on the existing staffing of 114 sworn officers. Police Department service cost calculations are shown in **Tables A-14** and **B-14**.

#### **Fire**

EPS has been working with the City's Fire Department staff to forecast resources necessary to provide fire services to the new residents and employees in the FTSSP. The Fire Department has a five-minute response standard and plans to relocate an existing fire station (Station 39) to meet this standard upon the Project's buildout. The Project is also planned to dedicate a site for the joint fire training between Fairfield and Vacaville fire departments. This analysis does not assume any operating cost impacts associated with the training facility.

EPS utilizes a marginal cost approach given that the relocation of the existing station is expected to meet the service standard for fire protection without resulting in a significant increase in expenditures. Existing staff levels are sufficient to meet increased demand from the FTSSP and the new fire station is not likely to result in higher utilities expenditures because a portion of the cost increase will be offset by a more efficient design of the new building despite a larger area. This approach results in a cost increase of approximately \$11,000 a year, as shown in **Tables A-15** and **B-15**.

#### **Public Works**

The Public Works department provides various types of services, including engineering, landscaping, park maintenance, streets, transportation, and water. This analysis assumes that specific maintenance costs will be the result of the Project, with the improvements phased in proportionally to residential absorption unless noted otherwise. It is also worth stating that the department has recently shifted toward private-sector service provision in several areas, which has decreased operating costs. Future costs will depend on the current success of contracting with private providers. Each item is estimated based on the interviews with the Public Works Department and is illustrated in **Tables A-16** and **B-16** and described below.

#### Roads

The Project is planned to include a number of arterial, collector, and residential roads, including Manuel Campos Parkway/Vanden Road, Peabody Road, New Canon Road, McCrory Road, and internal collectors, and residential streets. Internal industrial roads are not included in this analysis and their life-cycle maintenance is assumed to be supported by the revenues generated from industrial development.

Based on interviews with the Public Works Department, the City's annual life-cycle maintenance cost per square foot is estimated at about \$0.25 for arterials (\$0.12 for maintenance and \$0.13 for replacement), \$0.22 for collectors (\$0.11 for maintenance and \$0.11 for replacement), and \$0.20 for residential streets (\$0.10 for maintenance and \$0.10 for replacement). This analysis assumes that one-half of the arterial maintenance cost (about \$0.06 per square foot) is covered by non-Project-related funding such as State and federal funding sources (i.e., gas taxes, grants,

etc.). In addition, the annual replacement costs are excluded from this analysis assuming that they would be covered by non-Project-related funding. This level of investment reflects the current budget-constrained General Fund services that the Public Works Department is currently able to provide.

**Tables A-16** and **B-16** show the estimated road maintenance costs as described above and reflected in the rest of this analysis. As shown, the annual road maintenance costs are estimated at about \$730,000 at Project buildout. **Tables A-16a** and **B-16a** show the life-cycle maintenance costs, as a point of comparison. As shown, the annual road costs (including maintenance and replacement costs) are estimated at \$1.65 million. To the extent that the General Fund would be relied upon to fully cover life-cycle maintenance costs, the Public Works costs would increase by about \$900,000 per year by Project buildout.

#### Sidewalks and Street Lights

The City's expenditures for sidewalks and street lights include curbs and gutters, landscaping and sidewalks, and street lights. Interviews with the Department of Public Works suggest an average annual maintenance cost of \$0.50 per linear foot for curbs and gutters, \$0.25 per square foot for landscaping and sidewalks, and \$120 per street light. The street light cost is below a typical citywide cost and reflects higher energy efficiency lights in the Project that would generate cost savings to the City of about 30 percent.

#### Street Sweeping

The City will be responsible for the street sweeping cost within the Project. The Public Works Department indicates the cost of \$1,000 per mile per year, resulting in the annual estimate of approximately \$38,000 by buildout.

#### Stormwater and Drainage

The City will be responsible for the stormwater and drainage of the Project surface. The City estimates an average cost of \$100 per acre for the acreage within the Project, excluding industrial uses, open space, and mitigation land.

#### Parks and Open Space

The Project is planned to include a number of parks, including the Great Park and Lake Park, Linear Parks, a Neighborhood Park, and Open Space within Development Envelope. The FTSSP includes a 22-acre lake park, with the 11-acre lake intended to be a centerpiece for the proposed development that will accommodate community uses, such as concerts, festivals, and other recreation activities. The lake would also provide walking trails, seating areas, fishing outcroppings, and landscape features. In addition, the lake would provide flood storage and a source of irrigation supply and also function as a retention basin. In addition, the Project is

estimated to include various open space areas, including wetlands, habitat conservation, and detention basins. However, this analysis assumes that only 150 acres of open space would be funded and maintained by the City (the Kelley Property).<sup>5</sup>

The City estimates an annual cost of about \$14,000 per acre for Linear Park and \$15,250 per acre for all other parks, while an open space maintenance cost of \$100 per acre is estimated by EPS. The maintenance cost assumptions result in the total park and open space maintenance cost of \$2.3 million per year at buildout under both scenarios.

#### **Other Costs**

The Public Works cost estimates exclude water and sewer impacts as these costs are assumed to be covered by offsetting revenues (i.e., gas tax, user fees) and are assumed to result in no additional maintenance cost to the City.

#### Finance

Core services provided by this department include accounting and budgeting, business licenses, information technology, purchasing, and water billing. It is assumed that 30 percent of the Finance service costs are variable and will be affected by the Project, resulting in a variable expenditure of \$2.43 per capita.

# County-Related Costs

The City of Fairfield incurs costs associated with County booking fees and County animal control. These costs are budgeted at \$33,000 and \$594,000, respectively, in the City's FY2010–11 Adopted Budget. Assuming that these costs are 50 percent variable yields a per capita estimate of \$0.16 for County booking fees and \$2.79 for County animal control, as shown in **Tables A-8** and **B-8**.

# Library

A 30,000-square-foot library is envisioned in the planning area 4 of the Project. EPS assumes completion of the library in Year 5. Based on the feedback provided by the City, the City's General Fund is likely to incur an annual operating cost of \$200,000 associated with the library. Although historically library operation has been managed by the County, a shift toward city financial support has been occurring recently, with the City likely to absorb a portion of the County's operating cost.

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Other open space maintenance costs are assumed to be funded through private sources and public safety CFD special taxes generated by industrial uses.

#### Other Costs

This category includes expenditures associated with the County tax administration fees, county government center plaza maintenance, LAFCO contributions, legislative advocacy, neighborhood cleanup, planning/EIR studies, and other expense/contingency items. The amount of development in the Project is not anticipated to generate any net impact in expenditures associate with these uses of funds.

# APPENDIX A: Maximum Buildout Scenario



Table A-1
Fairfield General Assumptions and Data 2009-2010
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Amount	Sources	
Housing Units	38,390	DOF	
Occupied Households	35,880	DOF	
Population	106,440	DOF	
Persons/Household	2.87	DOF	
Employment	45,120	ABAG 2009	
Daytime Population (1)	129,000	DOF/ABAG 2009	

<sup>(1)</sup> Estimated by adding total residential population and half of total employment. It represents a measure of public service demand in which employees are given one-half the weight of residents because of more limited service requirements.

Sources: Department of Finance (2009), ABAG Projections 2009, and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

Table A-2
Residential and Commercial Development Program by Plan Area
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Acres	Total Units/Sq.Ft.	•	Plan Area 1 (units/sq.ft.)			Plan Area 4 (units/sq.ft.)				Plan Area 8 (units/sq.ft.)	Plan Area 9 (units/sq.ft.)
Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	86 168 <u>255</u> 509	2,793 2,254 <u>1,709</u> 6,756	32 13 <u>7</u> 13	463 197 <u>457</u> 1,117	942 417 <u>58</u> 1,417	541 460 <u>25</u> 1,026	848 505 <u>319</u> 1,671	0 675 <u>745</u> 1,421	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u>	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>104</u> 104
Commercial Retail Mixed-Use Subtotal	27 <u>20</u> 47	176,000 <u>186,000</u> 362,000	15% <u>21%</u> 18%	0 <u>0</u> 0	121,000 <u>186,000</u> 307,000	0 <u>0</u> 0	55,000 <u>0</u> 55,000	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u> 0	_	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u> 0

Sources: AECOM Land Use Plan and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

Table A-3
Public Uses Development Program by Plan Area\*
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Total Acres	Plan Area 1 (acres)	Plan Area 2 (acres)	Plan Area 3 (acres)	Plan Area 4 (acres)	Plan Area 5 (acres)	Plan Area 6 (acres)	Plan Area 7 (acres)	Plan Area 8 (acres)	Plan Area 9 (acres)
Active Parks/Recreation										
Great Park	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0
Linear Park	54	13	13	0	2	8	0	0	18	0
Lake Park	21	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0
Open Space within Development	<u>27</u>	0	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	0	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	152	13	15	5	40	11	0	50	18	0
Open Space										
Kelley Property	150	0	0	0	150	0	0	0	0	0
Roads/Railroad (1)	<u>229</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>17</u>
TOTAL	531	38	37	9	208	41	13	104	63	17

<sup>\*</sup>Note: excludes passive open space and conservation acreage. Maintenance of these lands will be funded through an existing CFD.

Sources: AECOM Land Use Plan and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

<sup>(1) 55</sup> acres of plan area 10 proportionally disbursed between the remaining 9 plan areas.

Table A-4 Annual Residential and Commercial Absorption by Plan Area (20-year buildout)\* Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Plan Area 1 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	463 197 <u>457</u> 1,117	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	154 0 <u>0</u> 154	154 0 <u>65</u> 220	154 98 <u>65</u> 318	0 98 <u>65</u> 164	0 0 <u>65</u> 65	0 0 <u>65</u> 65	0 0 <u>65</u> 65	0 0 <u>65</u> 65
Plan Area 2 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	942 417 <u>58</u> 1,417	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	188 0 <u>12</u> 200	188 104 <u>12</u> 304	188 104 <u>12</u> 304	188 104 <u>12</u> 304	188 104 <u>12</u> 304
Commercial Employment Retail Mixed-Use Subtotal	0 121,000 <u>186,000</u> 307,000	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>46,500</u> 46,500	0 0 <u>46,500</u> 46,500	0 121,000 <u>46,500</u> 167,500	0 0 <u>46,500</u> 46,500
Plan Area 3 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	541 460 <u>25</u> 1,026	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	180 0 <u>0</u> 180	180 115 <u>0</u> 295	180 115 <u>0</u> 295	0 115 <u>25</u> 140	0 115 <u>0</u> 115	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0
Plan Area 4 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	848 505 <u>319</u> 1,671	0 126 <u>80</u> 206	0 126 <u>80</u> 206	0 126 <u>80</u> 206	0 126 <u>80</u> 206	170 0 <u>0</u> 170	170 0 <u>0</u> 170	170 0 <u>0</u> 170	170 0 <u>0</u> 170	170 0 <u>0</u> 170	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0
Commercial Employment Retail Mixed-Use Subtotal	0 55,000 <u>0</u> 55,000	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	<u>0</u>	0 55,000 <u>0</u> 55,000	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0									
Plan Area 5 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	0 675 <u>745</u> 1,421	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u>	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 113 <u>93</u> 206	0 113 <u>93</u> 206	0 113 <u>93</u> 206	0 113 <u>93</u> 206	0 113 <u>93</u> 206	0 113 <u>93</u> 206	0 0 <u>93</u> 93	0 0 <u>93</u> 93	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0
Plan Area 9 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	0 0 <u>104</u> 104	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u>	0 0 <u>0</u>	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>15</u> 15	0 0 <u>15</u> 15	0 0 <u>15</u> 15	0 0 <u>15</u> 15	0 0 <u>15</u> 15	0 0 <u>15</u> 15	0 0 <u>15</u> 15
TOTAL Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Total	2,793 2,254 <u>1,709</u> 6,756	0 126 <u>80</u> 206	0 126 <u>80</u> 206	0 126 <u>80</u> 206	0 126 <u>80</u> 206	170 113 <u>93</u> 375	170 113 <u>93</u> 375	170 113 <u>93</u> 375	170 113 <u>93</u> 375	170 113 <u>93</u> 375	180 113 <u>93</u> 386	180 115 <u>93</u> 388	180 115 <u>93</u> 388	154 115 <u>25</u> 294	154 115 <u>80</u> 350	154 98 <u>80</u> 333	188 98 <u>92</u> 379	188 104 <u>92</u> 385	188 104 <u>92</u> 385	188 104 <u>92</u> 385	188 104 <u>92</u> 385
Commercial Retail Mixed-Use Subtotal	176,000 <u>186,000</u> 362,000	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u> 0	<u>0</u>	55,000 <u>0</u> 55,000	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 46,500 46,500	0 46,500 46,500	121,000 46,500 167,500	0 46,500 46,500									

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. 627/2011

P.\20000s\20086Fairfield\_FiscalModel/20086modt5.xls

Table A-5
Timing of Public Uses\*
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	5	10	15	20
Streets (sq.ft.)				
Arterial	572,987	1,245,105	1,842,037	2,612,430
Collector	298,492	648,625	959,591	1,360,920
Residential	<u>937,377</u>	<u>2,036,927</u>	<u>3,013,477</u>	<u>4,273,800</u>
Total	1,808,856	3,930,657	5,815,104	8,247,150
Streets (linear ft.)	44,181	96,006	142,033	201,435
Landscaping/Sidewalks (sq.ft.)				
Arterials	544,735	1,183,713	1,751,212	2,483,620
Collectors	298,009	647,577	958,040	1,358,720
Other	606,538	<u>1,318,011</u>	<u>1,949,897</u>	2,765,400
Total	1,449,283	3,149,301	4,659,149	6,607,740
Street Lights				
Arterials	163	354	524	743
Collectors	<u>276</u>	<u>599</u>	<u>886</u>	<u>1,257</u>
Total	439	953	1,410	2,000
Parks and Open Space (acres)				
Great Park	0	16	33	50
Lake Park	11	22	22	22
Linear Park	12	26	38	54
Neighborhood Park	1	2	4	5
Open Space Within Development Envelop	5	11	17	24
Kelley Property (1)	<u>150</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>150</u>
Total	179	228	264	305

<sup>\*</sup>Note: phased based on the share of developed acreage by year per absorption schedule. Street improvements include Manuel Campos Parkway/Vanden Road, Peabody Road, half of the New Cannon Road, McCrory Road, and internal collectors, and residential streets per CBG estimates. Great Park and Lake Park phasing provided by City.

<sup>(1)</sup> Assumed to be incurred in the first year of the plan area 4.

Table A-6
Fiscal Factor Assumptions
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

	Total	Projected Po	pulation	Projected En	nployment	Market V	alue
Item	Units/Sq.Ft.	Persons/Unit	Total	Sq.Ft./Emp.	Total	\$ / Unit or / Sq.Ft. (1)	Total
Residential							
High Density	2,793	2.4	6,591	0	0	\$225,000	\$628,425,000
Medium Density	2,254	2.9	6,606	0	0	\$330,000	\$743,820,000
Low Density	<u>1,709</u>	3.4	5,862	0	0	\$390,000	\$666,510,000
Subtotal	6,756		19,060		0		\$2,038,755,000
Non-Residential (2)							
Retail	176,000	0	0	350	503	\$250	\$44,000,000
Mixed-Use	186,000	0	<u>0</u>	300	<u>620</u>	\$250	\$46,500,000
Subtotal	362,000		0		1,123		\$90,500,000
TOTAL			19,060		1,123		\$2,129,255,000

<sup>(1)</sup> Medium and low density unit values are based on the recent comparable sales in Fairfield. High density unit values are based on the construction cost average between apartment rentals assumed at \$200,000 per unit and for-sale condominiums assumed at \$250,000 per unit with a 50/50 split between rentals and for-sale product types.

<sup>(2)</sup> Excludes 94,000 square feet of existing warehouse uses.

Table A-7
Cumulative Fiscal Factors
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Total	5	10	15	20
Population Employment	19,060	3,622	8,895	13,750	19,060
	1,123	157	157	157	1,123
Daytime Population (1) Market Value	19,621	3,701	8,973	13,829	19,621
	2,129,255,000	\$416,259,774	\$976,716,514	\$1,491,295,273	\$2,129,255,000

<sup>(1)</sup> Estimated by adding total residential population and half of total employment. It represents a measure of public service demand in which employees are given one-half the weight of residents because of more limited service requirements.

Table A-7a
Cumulative Market Value by Planning Area
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Total		10	15	20
Cumulative Value					_
Plan Area 1	\$347,283,148	\$0	\$0	\$187,547,627	\$347,283,148
Plan Area 2	\$449,136,445	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$449,136,445
Plan Area 3	\$283,273,547	\$0	\$40,543,548	\$283,273,547	\$283,273,547
Plan Area 4	\$495,345,399	\$342,788,513	\$495,345,399	\$495,345,399	\$495,345,399
Plan Area 5	\$513,493,595	\$73,471,261	\$440,827,567	\$513,493,595	\$513,493,595
Plan Area 6	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Plan Area 7	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Plan Area 8	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Plan Area 9	<u>\$40,722,864</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$11,635,104</u>	\$40,722,864
Total	\$2,129,255,000	\$416,259,774	\$976,716,514	\$1,491,295,273	\$2,129,255,000

Table A-8
Budget Summary and Estimating Factors
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	FY2010-11 Total	% Variable (1)		Allocation Factor
General Revenues		. ,		
Property Taxes	\$9,331,000			see Tables 10
Property Tax in Lieu of VLF	\$6,704,000			see Table 11
Sales & Use Tax	\$13,794,000			see Table 12
Transient Occupancy Tax	\$1,466,000		_	not impacted
Real Property Transfer Tax	\$399,000			see Table 11
Business License Tax	\$1,034,000		\$22.92	per employee
Utility Users Tax	\$3,566,000			per capita
Admissions Tax	\$435,000			per capita
	,			•
Vehicle License Fees	\$293,000			per capita
Franchise Fees	\$3,578,000			per capita
Fines and Misc. Income	\$1,400,000			per capita
Intergovernmental	\$216,000			not impacted
Interest Income	\$407,000			not impacted
Development-Related Fees	\$2,804,000			not impacted
Department Revenue	<u>\$4,064,000</u>		-	not impacted
Total Revenues (2)	\$49,491,000			
General Fund Expenditures				
General Government	\$544,000	25%	\$1.28	per capita
Human Resources	\$569,000	25%		per capita
Community Resources (3)	\$5,049,000	90%		per capita
Community Development (4)	\$1,706,000	30%		per capita
Police	\$32,084,000			see Table 14
Fire	\$14,127,000			see Table 15
Public Works	\$7,940,000			see Table 16
Finance	\$862,000	30%	\$2.43	per capita
County Booking Fees	\$33,000	50%		per capita
County Animal Control	\$594,000	50%		per capita
Library (5)	\$125,000	-		fixed cost
Other (6)	\$1,331,000		-	not impacted
Total Expenditures (2)	\$64,964,000			-
NET ANNUAL FISCAL BALANCE	(\$15,473,000)			

Note: excludes operating and capital transfers.

- (1) Percentage of costs that are population-dependent, as opposed to fixed costs.
- (2) Excludes interfund transfers.
- (3) Per capita cost is based on the net cost after reflecting fee recovery collected by the Department.
- (4) Includes planning and building permits; assumed that the cost will increase in proportion to the existing citywide per daytime population average with 85% of the cost recovered from development-related fees.
- (5) The City's General Fund portion is estimated at \$200,000 a year by the City staff; library completion is assumed in year 5.
- (6) Includes county tax administration fees, county government center plaza maintenance, LAFCO contributions, legislative advocacy, neighborhood cleanup, planning/EIR studies, and other expense/contingency.

Table A-9
Cumulative General Fund Revenues
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	5	10	15	20
Property Taxes	\$518,243	\$1,216,012	\$1,850,806	\$2,626,960
Property Tax in Lieu of VLF	\$273,075	\$608,989	\$882,817	\$1,194,864
Sales & Use Tax	\$53,415	\$127,791	\$196,078	\$270,554
Real Property Transfer Tax	\$22,138	\$52,963	\$81,265	\$112,132
Business License Tax	\$3,601	\$3,601	\$3,601	\$25,732
Utility Users Tax	\$121,357	\$297,996	\$460,668	\$638,551
Admissions Tax	\$14,804	\$36,351	\$56,195	\$77,894
Vehicle License Fees	\$9,971	\$24,485	\$37,851	\$52,466
Franchise Fees	\$121,765	\$298,998	\$462,218	\$640,699
Fines and Misc. Income	\$47,644	<u>\$116,992</u>	<u>\$180,857</u>	\$250,693
Total Revenues	\$1,186,015	\$2,784,178	\$4,212,356	\$5,890,545

Table A-10
Assessed Value and Property Tax Calculation
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Assumption / Factor	5	10	15	20
Existing Assessed Value Planning Area 1 Planning Area 2 Subtotal (1)		\$8,710,483 <u>\$10,536,408</u> \$19,246,891	\$8,710,483 <u>\$10,536,408</u> \$19,246,891	\$4,006,453 <u>\$10,536,408</u> \$14,542,861	\$0 <u>\$0</u> \$0
Redeveloped Existing Assessed Value Planning Area 1 Planning Area 2 Subtotal (1)	<u>ie</u>	\$0 <u>\$0</u> \$0	\$0 <u>\$0</u> \$0	(\$2,323,347) \$0 (\$2,323,347)	(\$638,544) (\$2,181,396) (\$2,819,940)
New Development Value Planning Area 1 Planning Area 2 Planning Area 3 Planning Area 4 Planning Area 5 Planning Area 6 Planning Area 7 Planning Area 8 Planning Area 9 Total New Development Value		\$0 \$0 \$0 \$38,139,222 \$73,471,261 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$1111,610,483	\$0 \$0 \$40,543,548 \$0 \$73,471,261 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$114,014,809	\$92,630,838 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$98,448,390	\$25,458,462 \$92,986,581 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$124,262,594
Net New Value Cumulative Net New Value		\$111,610,483 \$416,259,774	\$114,014,809 \$976,716,514	\$96,125,043 \$1,486,591,243	\$121,442,654 \$2,110,008,109
Property Tax Assessed Value Increase Net New Property Tax Net New Property Tax to GF (2)	1.00% of net value increase 12.5% of the new property tax value	\$416,259,774 \$4,162,598 <b>\$518,243</b>	\$976,716,514 \$9,767,165 <b>\$1,216,012</b>	\$1,486,591,243 \$14,865,912 <b>\$1,850,806</b>	\$2,110,008,109 \$21,100,081 <b>\$2,626,960</b>

<sup>(1)</sup> Based on the parcel assessed values. Assessed values for planning areas 3 through 9 are excluded due to lower assessed values that would not likely have significant impacts on the fiscal performance.

<sup>(2)</sup> Based on the 2000 Master Property Tax Sharing Agreement between the City and Solano County.

Table A-11
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF and Real Property Transfer Tax Calculation
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Assumption / Factor	5	10	15	20
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF Property Tax in Lieu of VLF (yea Citywide Assessed Value (1) Net Value Increase % Increase in Assessed Value re Net New Property Tax In Lieu of	elative to Year 1 Start	\$6,905,289 \$10,305,649,291 \$416,259,774 4.07% <b>\$273,075</b>	\$7,247,542 \$10,863,701,705 \$976,716,514 9.08% \$608,989	\$7,535,741 \$11,391,466,200 \$1,486,591,243 13.17% \$882,817	\$7,841,764 \$11,989,565,455 \$2,110,008,109 17.82% <b>\$1,194,864</b>
Real Property Transfer Tax Annual Residential Turnover Real Property Transfer Tax	10% of residential AV \$0.55 per \$1,000 in AV	\$40,250,977 <b>\$22,138</b>	\$96,296,651 <b>\$52,963</b>	\$147,754,527 <b>\$81,265</b>	\$203,875,500 <b>\$112,132</b>

<sup>(1)</sup> Net assessed value projection for FY 2010-2011 based on the City's General Fund budget. It is assumed that the Project will cause the only increase to the citywide assessed value from FY 2011-2012.

Table A-12
Sales Tax Calculation
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Factor	5	10	15	20
Average Unit Sales Price Annual Mortgage Payment (1) Average Annual Income (2) Average HH Taxable Retail Exp. (3) Average Per Household Expenditures Captured by Fairfield	25%	\$297,462 \$17,288 \$57,627 \$15,790 \$3,947	\$295,455 \$17,172 \$57,239 \$15,683 \$3,921	\$295,766 \$17,190 \$57,299 \$15,700 \$3,925	\$292,904 \$17,023 \$56,744 \$15,548 \$3,887
New Residential Units		375	386	333	385
New Retail Sales Captured by Fairfield Cumulative New Retail Sales Captured by Fairfield		\$1,481,131 \$5,341,520	\$1,513,037 \$12,779,080	\$1,306,463 \$19,607,816	\$1,494,761 \$27,055,369
New Sales Tax to Fairfield General Fund	1.0%	\$53,415	\$127,791	\$196,078	\$270,554

<sup>(1)</sup> Based on the mortgage amount with a 20 percent down payment and 6.0 percent interest rate and 30-year mortgage period.

<sup>(2)</sup> Annual mortgage payment is assumed to make up 30 percent of household income.

<sup>(3)</sup> An average household expenditure is assumed at 27.4 percent of income based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics Retail Expenditure Survey in San Francisco.

Table A-13
Cumulative General Fund Expenditures
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	5	10	15	20
General Government	\$4,628	\$11,365	\$17,569	\$24,353
Human Resources	\$4,841	\$11,887	\$18,376	\$25,472
Community Resources	\$88,547	\$217,430	\$336,122	\$465,913
Community Development	\$17,417	\$42,769	\$66,116	\$91,646
Police	\$1,101,022	\$2,703,589	\$4,179,449	\$5,793,304
Fire	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000
Public Works	\$920,849	\$2,198,395	\$3,226,590	\$4,478,230
Finance	\$8,801	\$21,610	\$33,407	\$46,307
County Booking Fees	\$562	\$1,379	\$2,132	\$2,955
County Animal Control	\$10,107	\$24,819	\$38,367	\$53,183
Library	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
Total Expenditures	\$2,367,775	\$5,444,243	\$8,129,129	\$11,192,362

Table A-14
Police Department Service and Cost Estimate
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Assumptions	5	10	15	20
Annual Police Budget (FY 2010-2011) Sworn Officers Average Cost per Sworn Officer (1)	\$32,084,000 114 \$253,295				
Variable Costs Variable Cost per Sworn Officer	90% \$227,965				
Required Officers per 1,000 Population (2) Project-Related Officer Net Increase	1.20	4.35	10.67	16.50	22.87
Project Cost for Police		\$1,101,022	\$2,703,589	\$4,179,449	\$5,793,304

<sup>(1)</sup> Includes support staff, administration, and vehicles.

<sup>(2)</sup> Based on the existing General Plan standard.

Table A-15
Fire Department Service and Cost Estimate
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	5	10	15	20
Annual Fire Operations Budget (FY2009-2010) Existing Operating Cost for Station 39 (1)				
New Operating Cost After Station Relocation (1),(2)				
Net Increase due to Relocation (3)	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000

<sup>(1)</sup> Includes personnel, utilities, building repairs, and fire apparatus annual cost.

<sup>(2)</sup> Based on station 41 costs; the increase in cost is associated with higher utilities expenditures because of a larger building. A portion of the utilities increase will be offset by a more efficient design of the new building.

<sup>(3)</sup> Does not capture additional increase in potential salaries and related costs that would have increased without the TSSP Project if the Station had not been relocated.

Table A-16
Public Works Costs
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Annual Maintenance	5	10	15	20
Roads					
Arterial (1)	\$0.06 per sq.ft.	\$34,379	\$74,706	\$110,522	\$156,746
Collector	\$0.11 per sq.ft.	\$32,834	\$71,349	\$105,555	\$149,701
Residential	\$0.10 per sq.ft.	<u>\$93,738</u>	<u>\$203,693</u>	<u>\$301,348</u>	<u>\$427,380</u>
Total		\$160,951	\$349,748	\$517,425	\$733,827
Sidewalks and Street Lights					
Curbs/Gutters	\$0.50 per linear ft	\$22,090	\$48,003	\$71,016	\$100,718
Landscaping/Sidewalks					
Arterials	\$0.25 per sq.ft.	\$136,184	\$295,928	\$437,803	\$620,905
Collectors	\$0.25 per sq.ft.	\$74,502	\$161,894	\$239,510	\$339,680
Street Lighting					
Arterials	\$120 per light	\$19,556	\$42,494	\$62,867	\$89,160
Collectors	\$120 per light	\$33,084	<u>\$71,892</u>	<u>\$106,358</u>	<u>\$150,840</u>
Total		\$285,416	\$620,211	\$917,555	\$1,301,303
Street Sweeping	\$1,000 per mile	\$8,368	\$18,183	\$26,900	\$38,151
Stormwater and Drainage	\$100 per acre	\$20,551	\$44,658	\$66,068	\$93,700
Parks and Open Space (2)					
Great Park	\$15,250 per acre	\$0	\$244,000	\$503,250	\$762,500
Linear Park	\$14,000 per acre	\$165,814	\$360,316	\$533,059	\$756,000
Lake Park	\$15,250 per acre	\$167,750	\$335,500	\$335,500	\$335,500
Neighborhood Park	\$15,250 per acre	\$16,724	\$36,341	\$53,764	\$76,250
Open Space Within Dev't Envelope	\$15,250 per acre	\$80,275	\$174,438	\$258,068	\$366,000
Kelley Property	\$100 per acre	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>
Total		\$445,563	\$1,165,595	\$1,698,642	\$2,311,250
Total Public Works Cost		\$920,849	\$2,198,395	\$3,226,590	\$4,478,230

Note: excludes open space and habitat costs assumed to be covered by the 2004 CFD applied to the TSSP development.

<sup>(1)</sup> Costs reflect annual maintenance costs only and do not include any replacement costs. Arterial maintenance cost reduced by 50% (from \$0.12 to \$0.06 per square foot) to reflect offsetting federal and state funding proceeds, such as Federal Highway Bill, gas taxes, and Prop 42.

<sup>(2)</sup> Excludes other habitat and open space maintenance costs assumed to be funded through private sources and public safety CFD generated by industrial uses.

Table A-16a
Full Public Works Costs
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Annual Maintenance	5	10	15	20
Roads					
Arterial (1)	\$0.19 per sq.ft.	\$108,868	\$236,570	\$349,987	\$496,362
Collector	\$0.22 per sq.ft.	\$65,668	\$142,698	\$211,110	\$299,402
Residential	\$0.20 per sq.ft.	\$187,47 <u>5</u>	\$407,38 <u>5</u>	\$602,695	\$854,760
Total		\$362,011	\$786,653	\$1,163,792	\$1,650,524
Sidewalks and Street Lights					
Curbs/Gutters	\$0.50 per linear ft	\$22,090	\$48,003	\$71,016	\$100,718
Landscaping/Sidewalks					
Arterials	\$0.25 per sq.ft.	\$136,184	\$295,928	\$437,803	\$620,905
Collectors	\$0.25 per sq.ft.	\$74,502	\$161,894	\$239,510	\$339,680
Landscaping/Sidewalks					
Arterials	\$120 per light	\$19,556	\$42,494	\$62,867	\$89,160
Collectors	\$120 per light	<u>\$33,084</u>	<u>\$71,892</u>	<u>\$106,358</u>	<u>\$150,840</u>
Total		\$285,416	\$620,211	\$917,555	\$1,301,303
Street Sweeping	\$1,000 per mile	\$8,368	\$18,183	\$26,900	\$38,151
Stormwater and Drainage	\$100 per acre	\$20,551	\$44,658	\$66,068	\$93,700
Parks and Open Space (2)					
Great Park	\$15,250 per acre	\$0	\$244,000	\$503,250	\$762,500
Linear Park	\$14,000 per acre	\$165,814	\$360,316	\$533,059	\$756,000
Lake Park	\$15,250 per acre	\$167,750	\$335,500	\$335,500	\$335,500
Neighborhood Park	\$15,250 per acre	\$16,724	\$36,341	\$53,764	\$76,250
Open Space Within Dev't Envelope	\$15,250 per acre	\$80,275	\$174,438	\$258,068	\$366,000
Kelley Property	\$100 per acre	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>
Total		\$445,563	\$1,165,595	\$1,698,642	\$2,311,250
Total Public Works Cost		\$1,121,910	\$2,635,300	\$3,872,957	\$5,394,927

Note: excludes open space and habitat costs assumed to be covered by the 2004 CFD applied to the TSSP development.

<sup>(1)</sup> Costs reflect all-in maintenance costs only, including annual maintenance and annualized replacement costs. The maintenance portion of the annual arterial cost is reduced by 50% to reflect offsetting federal and state funding proceeds, such as Federal Highway Bill, gas taxes, and Prop 42.

<sup>(2)</sup> Excludes other habitat and open space maintenance costs assumed to be funded through private sources and public safety CFD generated by industrial uses.

## APPENDIX B: Reduced Density Scenario



Table B-1
Fairfield General Assumptions and Data 2009-2010
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Amount	Sources
Housing Units	38,390	DOF
Occupied Households	35,880	DOF
Population	106,440	DOF
Persons/Household	2.87	DOF
Employment	45,120	ABAG 2009
Daytime Population (1)	129,000	DOF/ABAG 2009

<sup>(1)</sup> Estimated by adding total residential population and half of total employment. It represents a measure of public service demand in which employees are given one-half the weight of residents because of more limited service requirements.

Sources: Department of Finance (2009), ABAG Projections 2009, and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

Table B-2
Residential and Commercial Development Program by Plan Area
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Acres	Total Units/Sq.Ft.	•	Plan Area 1 (units/sq.ft.)			Plan Area 4 (units/sq.ft.)				Plan Area 8 (units/sq.ft.)	
Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	86 168 <u>255</u> 509	2,289 1,932 <u>1,354</u> 5,575		379 169 <u>362</u> 910	772 358 <u>46</u> 1,176	443 395 <u>20</u> 857	695 432 <u>253</u> 1,380	0 579 <u>590</u> 1,169	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u>	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>83</u> 83
Commercial Retail Mixed-Use Subtotal	27 <u>20</u> 47	176,000 <u>186,000</u> 362,000	15% <u>21%</u> 18%	0 <u>0</u> 0	121,000 <u>186,000</u> 307,000	0 <u>0</u> 0	55,000 <u>0</u> 55,000	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u> 0	_	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u> 0

Sources: AECOM Land Use Plan and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

Table B-3
Public Uses Development Program by Plan Area\*
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Total Acres	Plan Area 1 (acres)	Plan Area 2 (acres)	Plan Area 3 (acres)	Plan Area 4 (acres)	Plan Area 5 (acres)	Plan Area 6 (acres)	Plan Area 7 (acres)	Plan Area 8 (acres)	Plan Area 9 (acres)
Active Parks/Recreation										
Great Park	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0
Linear Park	54	13	13	0	2	8	0	0	18	0
Lake Park	21	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0
Open Space within Development	<u>27</u>	0	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	0	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	152	13	15	5	40	11	0	50	18	0
Open Space										
Kelley Property	150	0	0	0	150	0	0	0	0	0
Roads/Railroad (1)	<u>229</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>17</u>
TOTAL	531	38	37	9	208	41	13	104	63	17

<sup>\*</sup>Note: excludes passive open space and conservation acreage. Maintenance of these lands will be funded through an existing CFD.

Sources: AECOM Land Use Plan and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

<sup>(1) 55</sup> acres of plan area 10 proportionally disbursed between the remaining 9 plan areas.

Table B-4 Annual Residential and Commercial Absorption by Plan Area (20-year buildout)\* Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Plan Area 1 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	379	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	126	126	0	0	0	0	0
	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	84	0	0	0	0
	<u>362</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>52</u>
	910	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	178	262	136	52	52	52	52
Plan Area 2 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	772	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	154	154	154	154
	358	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	89	89	89
	<u>46</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>
	1,176	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	253	253	253	253
Commercial Employment Retail Mixed-Use Subtotal	0 121,000 <u>186,000</u> 307,000	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 46,500 46,500	0 0 46,500 46,500	0 121,000 <u>46,500</u> 167,500	0 0 46,500 46,500
Plan Area 3 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	443	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	148	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	395	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	99	99	99	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	857	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	246	246	118	99	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan Area 4 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	695	0	0	0	0	139	139	139	139	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	432	108	108	108	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<u>253</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>									
	1,380	171	171	171	171	139	139	139	139	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commercial Employment Retail Mixed-Use Subtotal	0 55,000 <u>0</u> 55,000	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0	0 55,000 <u>0</u> 55.000	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u>	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u>	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0
Plan Area 5 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	579	0	0	0	0	96	96	96	96	96	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<u>590</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	0	<u>74</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>							
	1,169	0	0	0	0	170	170	170	170	170	170	74	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan Area 9 Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Subtotal	0 0 <u>83</u> 83	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u>	0 0 <u>0</u>	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>0</u> 0	0 0 <u>12</u> 12	0 0 <u>12</u> 12	0 0 <u>12</u> 12	0 0 <u>12</u> 12	0 0 <u>12</u> 12	0 0 <u>12</u> 12	0 0 <u>12</u> 12
TOTAL Residential High Density Medium Density Low Density Total	2,289	0	0	0	0	139	139	139	139	139	148	148	148	126	126	126	154	154	154	154	154
	1,932	108	108	108	108	96	96	96	96	96	96	99	99	99	99	84	84	89	89	89	89
	<u>1,354</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>73</u>							
	5,575	171	171	171	171	309	309	309	309	309	318	320	320	245	289	274	311	317	317	317	317
Commercial Retail Mixed-Use Subtotal	176,000 <u>186,000</u> 362,000	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u> 0	<u>0</u>	55,000 <u>0</u> 55,000	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 <u>0</u> 0	0 46,500 46,500	0 46,500 46,500	121,000 46,500 167,500	0 46,500 46,500									

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. 627/2011

P.\20000s\20086Fairfield\_FiscalModel/20086modt5.xls

Table B-5
Timing of Public Uses\*
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	5	10	15	20
Streets (sq.ft.)				
Arterial	572,987	1,245,105	1,842,037	2,612,430
Collector	298,492	648,625	959,591	1,360,920
Residential	<u>937,377</u>	<u>2,036,927</u>	<u>3,013,477</u>	<u>4,273,800</u>
Total	1,808,856	3,930,657	5,815,104	8,247,150
Streets (linear ft.)	44,181	96,006	142,033	201,435
Landscaping/Sidewalks (sq.ft.)				
Arterials	544,735	1,183,713	1,751,212	2,483,620
Collectors	298,009	647,577	958,040	1,358,720
Other	606,538	<u>1,318,011</u>	1,949,897	2,765,400
Total	1,449,283	3,149,301	4,659,149	6,607,740
Street Lights				
Arterials	163	354	524	743
Collectors	<u>276</u>	<u>599</u>	<u>886</u>	<u>1,257</u>
Total	439	953	1,410	2,000
Parks and Open Space (acres)				
Great Park	0	16	33	50
Lake Park	11	22	22	22
Linear Park	12	26	38	54
Neighborhood Park	1	2	4	5
Open Space Within Development Envelop	5	11	17	24
Kelley Property (1)	<u>150</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>150</u>
Total	174	216	247	281

<sup>\*</sup>Note: phased based on the share of developed acreage by year per absorption schedule. Street improvements include Manuel Campos Parkway/Vanden Road, Peabody Road, half of the New Cannon Road, McCrory Road, and internal collectors, and residential streets per CBG estimates. Great Park and Lake Park phasing provided by City.

<sup>(1)</sup> Assumed to be incurred in the first year of the plan area 4.

Table B-6
Fiscal Factor Assumptions
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

	Total	Projected Po	pulation	Projected Em	nployment	Market Value			
Item	Units/Sq.Ft.	Persons/Unit	Total	Sq.Ft./Emp.	Total	\$ / Unit or / Sq.Ft. (1)	Total		
Residential							_		
High Density	2,289	2.4	5,402	0	0	\$225,000	\$515,025,000		
Medium Density	1,932	2.9	5,663	0	0	\$330,000	\$637,560,000		
Low Density	<u>1,354</u>	3.4	4,644	0	0	\$390,000	\$528,060,000		
Subtotal	5,575		15,709		0		\$1,680,645,000		
Non-Residential (2)									
Retail	176,000	0	0	350	503	\$250	\$44,000,000		
Mixed-Use	186,000	0	0	300	<u>620</u>	\$250	\$46,500,000		
Subtotal	362,000		<u>0</u> 0		1,123		\$90,500,000		
TOTAL			15,709		1,123		\$1,771,145,000		

<sup>(1)</sup> Medium and low density unit values are based on the recent comparable sales in Fairfield. High density unit values are based on the construction cost average between apartment rentals assumed at \$200,000 per unit and for-sale condominiums assumed at \$250,000 per unit with a 50/50 split between rentals and for-sale product types.

<sup>(2)</sup> Excludes 94,000 square feet of existing warehouse uses.

Table B-7
Cumulative Fiscal Factors
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Total	5	10	15	20
Population Employment Daytime Population (1)	15,709 1,123 16,270	2,998 157 3,077	7,338 157 7,416	11,344 157 11,422	15,709 1,123 16,270
Market Value	1,771,145,000	\$346,897,694	\$808,245,762	\$1,232,946,818	\$1,771,145,000

<sup>(1)</sup> Estimated by adding total residential population and half of total employment. It represents a measure of public service demand in which employees are given one-half the weight of residents because of more limited service requirements.

Table B-7a
Cumulative Market Value by Planning Area
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Total	5	10	15	20
Plan Area 1	\$282,194,607	\$0	\$0	\$153,535,474	\$282,194,607
Plan Area 2	\$386,493,510	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$386,493,510
Plan Area 3	\$237,603,221	\$0	\$33,227,419	\$237,603,221	\$237,603,221
Plan Area 4	\$411,306,953	\$286,279,129	\$411,306,953	\$411,306,953	\$411,306,953
Plan Area 5	\$421,282,953	\$60,618,565	\$363,711,390	\$421,282,953	\$421,282,953
Plan Area 6	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Plan Area 7	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Plan Area 8	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Plan Area 9	<u>\$32,263,756</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	\$9,218,216	\$32,263,756
Total	\$1,771,145,000	\$346,897,694	\$808,245,762	\$1,232,946,818	\$1,771,145,000

Table B-8
Budget Summary and Estimating Factors
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	FY2010-11 % Total	Variable (1)	Allocatio	n Factor
General Revenues		,		
Property Taxes	\$9,331,000		see Tai	hles 10
Property Taxes Property Tax in Lieu of VLF	\$6,704,000		see Ta	
Sales & Use Tax	\$13,794,000		see Ta	
Transient Occupancy Tax	\$1,466,000		- not impa	
Real Property Transfer Tax	\$399,000		see Ta	
Business License Tax	\$1,034,000		\$22.92 per emp	
Utility Users Tax	\$3,566,000		\$33.50 per capi	
Admissions Tax	\$435,000		\$4.09 per capi	
	. ,			
Vehicle License Fees	\$293,000		\$2.75 per capi	
Franchise Fees	\$3,578,000		\$33.62 per capi	
Fines and Misc. Income	\$1,400,000		\$13.15 per capi	
Intergovernmental	\$216,000		- not impa	
Interest Income	\$407,000		- not impa	
Development-Related Fees	\$2,804,000		- not impa	
Department Revenue	<u>\$4,064,000</u>		- not impa	acted
Total Revenues (2)	\$49,491,000			
General Fund Expenditures				
General Government	\$544,000	25%	\$1.28 per capi	ta
Human Resources	\$569,000	25%	\$1.34 per capi	
Community Resources (3)	\$5,049,000	90%	\$24.44 per capi	
Community Development (4)	\$1,706,000	30%	\$4.81 per capi	
Police	\$32,084,000	23/0	see Ta	
Fire	\$14,127,000		see Ta	
Public Works	\$7,940,000		see Ta	
Finance	\$862,000	30%	\$2.43 per capi	
County Booking Fees	\$33,000	50%	\$0.16 per capi	
County Animal Control	\$594,000	50%	\$2.79 per capi	
Library (5)	\$125,000		fixed cos	
Other (6)	\$1,331,000		- not impa	
Total Expenditures (2)	\$64,964,000			
NET ANNUAL FISCAL BALANCE	(\$15,473,000)			

Note: excludes operating and capital transfers.

- (1) Percentage of costs that are population-dependent, as opposed to fixed costs.
- (2) Excludes interfund transfers.
- (3) Per capita cost is based on the net cost after reflecting fee recovery collected by the Department.
- (4) Includes planning and building permits; assumed that the cost will increase in proportion to the existing citywide per daytime population average with 85% of the cost recovered from development-related fees.
- (5) The City's General Fund portion is estimated at \$200,000 a year by the City staff; library completion is assumed in year 5.
- (6) Includes county tax administration fees, county government center plaza maintenance, LAFCO contributions, legislative advocacy, neighborhood cleanup, planning/EIR studies, and other expense/contingency.

Table B-9
Cumulative General Fund Revenues
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	5	10	15	20
Property Taxes	\$431,888	\$1,006,266	\$1,529,119	\$2,181,113
Property Tax in Lieu of VLF	\$228,404	\$510,045	\$744,057	\$1,019,459
Sales & Use Tax	\$44,210	\$105,434	\$161,794	\$223,031
Real Property Transfer Tax	\$18,323	\$43,697	\$67,056	\$92,435
Business License Tax	\$3,601	\$3,601	\$3,601	\$25,732
Utility Users Tax	\$100,444	\$245,825	\$380,041	\$526,288
Admissions Tax	\$12,253	\$29,987	\$46,360	\$64,199
Vehicle License Fees	\$8,253	\$20,198	\$31,226	\$43,242
Franchise Fees	\$100,782	\$246,653	\$381,320	\$528,059
Fines and Misc. Income	\$39,434	<u>\$96,510</u>	<u>\$149,203</u>	\$206,619
Total Revenues	\$987,593	\$2,308,218	\$3,493,777	\$4,910,179

Table B-10
Assessed Value and Property Tax Calculation
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Assumption / Factor	5	10	15	20
Existing Assessed Value Planning Area 1 Planning Area 2 Subtotal (1)		\$8,710,483 <u>\$10,536,408</u> \$19,246,891	\$8,710,483 <u>\$10,536,408</u> \$19,246,891	\$3,971,313 <u>\$10,536,408</u> \$14,507,721	\$0 <u>\$0</u> \$0
Redeveloped Existing Assessed Value Planning Area 1 Planning Area 2 Subtotal (1)	<u>.</u>	\$0 <u>\$0</u> \$0	\$0 <u>\$0</u> \$0	(\$2,359,495) \$0 (\$2,359,495)	(\$622,590) (\$2,166,598) (\$2,789,188)
New Development Value Planning Area 1 Planning Area 2 Planning Area 3 Planning Area 4 Planning Area 5 Planning Area 6 Planning Area 7 Planning Area 8 Planning Area 9 Total New Development Value		\$0 \$0 \$0 \$31,256,956 \$60,618,565 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$91,875,521	\$0 \$0 \$33,227,419 \$0 \$60,618,565 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$93,845,984	\$76,440,848 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$81,049,956	\$20,170,133 \$79,474,523 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$104,253,764
Net New Value Cumulative Net New Value		\$91,875,521 \$346,897,694	\$93,845,984 \$808,245,762	\$78,690,461 \$1,228,207,648	\$101,464,576 \$1,751,898,109
Property Tax Assessed Value Increase Net New Property Tax Net New Property Tax to GF (2)	1.00% of net value increase 12.5% of the new property tax value	\$346,897,694 \$3,468,977 <b>\$431,888</b>	\$808,245,762 \$8,082,458 <b>\$1,006,266</b>	\$1,228,207,648 \$12,282,076 <b>\$1,529,119</b>	\$1,751,898,109 \$17,518,981 <b>\$2,181,113</b>

<sup>(1)</sup> Based on the parcel assessed values. Assessed values for planning areas 3 through 9 are excluded due to lower assessed values that would not likely have significant impacts on the fiscal performance.

<sup>(2)</sup> Based on the 2000 Master Property Tax Sharing Agreement between the City and Solano County.

Table B-11
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF and Real Property Transfer Tax Calculation
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Assumption / Factor	5	10	15	20
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF Property Tax in Lieu of VLF (year	· ctart\	\$6,872,912	\$7,158,757	\$7,404,681	\$7,672,949
Citywide Assessed Value (1)	Starty	\$10,256,022,173	\$10,715,399,778	\$11,150,517,187	\$11,651,433,533
Net Value Increase % Increase in Assessed Value re Net New Property Tax In Lieu o		\$346,897,694 3.41% <b>\$228,404</b>	\$808,245,762 7.61% <b>\$510.045</b>	\$1,228,207,648 11.10% <b>\$744.057</b>	\$1,751,898,109 15.21% <b>\$1,019,459</b>
Real Property Transfer Tax  Annual Residential Turnover Real Property Transfer Tax	10% of residential AV \$0.55 per \$1,000 in AV	\$33,314,769 <b>\$18,323</b>	\$79,449,576 <b>\$43,697</b>	\$121,919,682 <b>\$67,056</b>	\$168,064,500 <b>\$92,435</b>

<sup>(1)</sup> Net assessed value projection for FY 2010-2011 based on the City's General Fund budget. It is assumed that the Project will cause the only increase to the citywide assessed value from FY 2011-2012.

Table B-12
Sales Tax Calculation
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Factor	5	10	15	20
Average Unit Sales Price Annual mortgage payment (1)		\$297,147 \$17,270	\$295,159 \$17,154	\$295,475 \$17,173	\$292,595 \$17,005
Average Annual Income (2) Average HH Taxable Retail Exp. (3) Average Per Household Expenditures Captured by Fairfield	25%	\$57,566 \$15,773 \$3,943	\$57,181 \$15,668 \$3,917	\$57,243 \$15,684 \$3,921	\$56,685 \$15,532 \$3,883
New Residential Units		309	318	274	317
New Retail Sales Captured by Fairfield Cumulative New Retail Sales Captured by Fairfield		\$1,219,237 \$4,421,048	\$1,245,386 \$10,543,383	\$1,075,576 \$16,179,393	\$1,229,233 \$22,303,057
New Sales Tax to Fairfield General Fund	1.0%	\$44,210	\$105,434	\$161,794	\$223,031

<sup>(1)</sup> Based on the mortgage amount with a 20 percent down payment and 6.0 percent interest rate and 30-year mortgage period.

<sup>(2)</sup> Annual mortgage payment is assumed to make up 30 percent of household income.

<sup>(3)</sup> An average household expenditure is assumed at 27.4 percent of income based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics Retail Expenditure Survey in San Francisco.

Table B-13
Cumulative General Fund Expenditures
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	5	10	15	20
General Government	\$3,831	\$9,375	\$14,494	\$20,072
Human Resources	\$4,007	\$9,806	\$15,160	\$20,994
Community Resources	\$73,288	\$179,364	\$277,294	\$384,002
Community Development	\$14,416	\$35,281	\$54,544	\$75,534
Police	\$911,289	\$2,230,272	\$3,447,957	\$4,774,794
Fire	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000
Public Works	\$920,849	\$2,198,395	\$3,226,590	\$4,478,230
Finance	\$7,284	\$17,827	\$27,560	\$38,165
County Booking Fees	\$465	\$1,137	\$1,758	\$2,435
County Animal Control	\$8,366	\$20,474	\$31,652	\$43,833
Library	\$200,000	<u>\$200,000</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>
Total Expenditures	\$2,154,794	\$4,912,933	\$7,308,010	\$10,049,058

Table B-14
Police Department Service and Cost Estimate
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Assumptions	5	10	15	20
Annual Police Budget (FY 2010-2011) Sworn Officers Average Cost per Sworn Officer (1)	\$32,084,000 114 \$253,295				
Variable Costs Variable Cost per Sworn Officer	90% \$227,965				
Required Officers per 1,000 Population (2) Project-Related Officer Net Increase	1.20	3.60	8.81	13.61	18.85
Project Cost for Police		\$911,289	\$2,230,272	\$3,447,957	\$4,774,794

<sup>(1)</sup> Includes support staff, administration, and vehicles.

<sup>(2)</sup> Based on the existing General Plan standard.

Table B-15
Fire Department Service and Cost Estimate
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	5	10	15	20
Annual Fire Operations Budget (FY2009-2010) Existing Operating Cost for Station 39 (1)				
New Operating Cost After Station Relocation (1),(2)				
Net Increase due to Relocation (3)	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000

<sup>(1)</sup> Includes personnel, utilities, building repairs, and fire apparatus annual cost.

<sup>(2)</sup> Based on station 41 costs; the increase in cost is associated with higher utilities expenditures because of a larger building. A portion of the utilities increase will be offset by a more efficient design of the new building.

<sup>(3)</sup> Does not capture additional increase in potential salaries and related costs that would have increased without the TSSP Project if the Station had not been relocated.

Table B-16
Public Works Costs
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Annual Maint	enance	5	10	15	20
Roads (1)						
Arterial (1)	\$0.06 pe	er sq.ft.	\$34,379	\$74,706	\$110,522	\$156,746
Collector	\$0.11 pe		\$32,834	\$71,349	\$105,555	\$149,701
Residential	\$0.10 pe	er sq.ft.	\$93,738	<u>\$203,693</u>	\$301,348	<u>\$427,380</u>
Total			\$160,951	\$349,748	\$517,425	\$733,827
Sidewalks and Street Lights						
Curbs/Gutters	\$0.50 pe	er linear ft	\$22,090	\$48,003	\$71,016	\$100,718
Landscaping/Sidewalks						
Arterials	\$0.25 pe		\$136,184	\$295,928	\$437,803	\$620,905
Collectors	\$0.25 pe	er sq.ft.	\$74,502	\$161,894	\$239,510	\$339,680
Street Lights						
Arterials	\$120 pe	_	\$19,556	\$42,494	\$62,867	\$89,160
Collectors	\$120 pe	er light	<u>\$33,084</u>	<u>\$71,892</u>	<u>\$106,358</u>	<u>\$150,840</u>
Total			\$285,416	\$620,211	\$917,555	\$1,301,303
Street Sweeping	\$1,000 pe	er mile	\$8,368	\$18,183	\$26,900	\$38,151
Stormwater and Drainage	\$100 pe	er acre	\$20,551	\$44,658	\$66,068	\$93,700
Parks and Open Space (2)						
Great Park	\$15,250 pe	er acre	\$0	\$244,000	\$503,250	\$762,500
Linear Park	\$14,000 pe	er acre	\$165,814	\$360,316	\$533,059	\$756,000
Lake Park	\$15,250 pe	er acre	\$167,750	\$335,500	\$335,500	\$335,500
Neighborhood Park	\$15,250 pe	er acre	\$16,724	\$36,341	\$53,764	\$76,250
Open Space Within Dev't Envelope	\$15,250 pe	er acre	\$80,275	\$174,438	\$258,068	\$366,000
Kelley Property	\$100 pe	er acre	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>
Total			\$445,563	\$1,165,595	\$1,698,642	\$2,311,250
<b>Total Public Works Cost</b>			\$920,849	\$2,198,395	\$3,226,590	\$4,478,230

Note: excludes open space and habitat costs assumed to be covered by the 2004 CFD applied to the TSSP development.

<sup>(1)</sup> Costs reflect annual maintenance costs only and do not include any replacement costs. Arterial maintenance cost reduced by 50% (from \$0.12 to \$0.06 per square foot) to reflect offsetting federal and state funding proceeds, such as Federal Highway Bill, gas taxes, and Prop 42.

<sup>(2)</sup> Excludes other habitat and open space maintenance costs assumed to be funded through private sources and public safety CFD generated by industrial uses.

Table B-16a
Full Public Works Costs
Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis; EPS #20086

Item	Annual Maintenance	5	10	15	20
Roads (1)					
Arterial (1)	\$0.19 per sq.ft.	\$108,868	\$236,570	\$349,987	\$496,362
Collector	\$0.22 per sq.ft.	\$65,668	\$142,698	\$211,110	\$299,402
Residential	\$0.20 per sq.ft.	\$187,47 <u>5</u>	\$407,385	\$602,695	<u>\$854,760</u>
Total		\$362,011	\$786,653	\$1,163,792	\$1,650,524
Sidewalks and Street Lights					
Curbs/Gutters	\$0.50 per linear ft	\$22,090	\$48,003	\$71,016	\$100,718
Landscaping/Sidewalks	·				
Arterials	\$0.25 per sq.ft.	\$136,184	\$295,928	\$437,803	\$620,905
Collectors	\$0.25 per sq.ft.	\$74,502	\$161,894	\$239,510	\$339,680
Street Lights					
Arterials	\$120 per light	\$19,556	\$42,494	\$62,867	\$89,160
Collectors	\$120 per light	<u>\$33,084</u>	<u>\$71,892</u>	<u>\$106,358</u>	<u>\$150,840</u>
Total		\$285,416	\$620,211	\$917,555	\$1,301,303
Street Sweeping	\$1,000 per mile	\$8,368	\$18,183	\$26,900	\$38,151
Stormwater and Drainage	\$100 per acre	\$20,551	\$44,658	\$66,068	\$93,700
Parks and Open Space (2)					
Great Park	\$15,250 per acre	\$0	\$244,000	\$503,250	\$762,500
Linear Park	\$14,000 per acre	\$165,814	\$360,316	\$533,059	\$756,000
Lake Park	\$15,250 per acre	\$167,750	\$335,500	\$335,500	\$335,500
Neighborhood Park	\$15,250 per acre	\$16,724	\$36,341	\$53,764	\$76,250
Open Space Within Dev't Envelope	\$15,250 per acre	\$80,275	\$174,438	\$258,068	\$366,000
Kelley Property	\$100 per acre	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>
Total		\$445,563	\$1,165,595	\$1,698,642	\$2,311,250
Total Public Works Cost		\$1,121,910	\$2,635,300	\$3,872,957	\$5,394,927

Note: excludes open space and habitat costs assumed to be covered by the 2004 CFD applied to the TSSP development.

<sup>(1)</sup> Costs reflect all-in maintenance costs only, including annual maintenance and annualized replacement costs. The maintenance portion of the annual arterial cost is reduced by 50% to reflect offsetting federal and state funding proceeds, such as Federal Highway Bill, gas taxes, and Prop 42.

<sup>(2)</sup> Excludes other habitat and open space maintenance costs assumed to be funded through private sources and public safety CFD generated by industrial uses.